1981-12

Career orientations of Coast Guard aviators

Goward, Dana Allen

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California

THESIS

CAREER ORIENTATIONS OF COAST GUARD AVIATORS

by

Dana Allen Goward

December 1981

Thesis Co-Advisors: J. Senger
R. Weitzman

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Career Orientations of Coast Guard Aviators		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Master's Thesis December 1981
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Dana Allen Goward		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		12. REPORT DATE December 1981
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 187
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Career orientation, Cosmopolitan(s), Pilots, Aviators, Aviator Careers, Pilot Careers, LDO(s), Limited Duty Officers, Specialists, Professionals, Career Paths.

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Individuals within the same profession often have widely different career orientations. Some think of themselves mostly as professional specialists while others regard themselves as primarily members of the organization. The goal of this study was to examine the career orientations of Coast Guard pilots and the feasibility of establishing a limited duty officer (LDO) career path for aviators in which pilots would be assigned to flight duties for their entire twenty year career.

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 0102-014-6601

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

A conservative analysis of the data indicated that 19 to 20 percent of the total aviator population would be willing to participate in an LDO program. Willingness to participate in an LDO program was found to vary significantly with (1) how an individual identified himself as a pilot or an officer, (2) commissioning source, (3) interest in becoming a unit instructor pilot, (4) perceived optimal tour length, and (5) rank.

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

Career Orientations of Coast Guard Aviators

by

Dana Allen Goward
Lieutenant, United States Coast Guard
B.S., United States Coast Guard Academy, 1974

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
December 1981

ABSTRACT

Individuals within the same profession often have widely different career orientations. Some think of themselves mostly as professional specialists while others regard themselves as primarily members of the organization. The goal of this study was to examine the career orientations of Coast Guard pilots and the feasibility of establishing a limited duty officer (LDO) career path for aviators in which pilots would be assigned to flight duties for their entire twenty year career.

A conservative analysis of the data indicated that 19 to 20 percent of the total aviator population would be willing to participate in an LDO program. Willingness to participate in an LDO program was found to vary significantly with (1) how an individual identified himself as a pilot or an officer, (2) commissioning source, (3) interest in becoming a unit instructor pilot, (4) perceived optimal tour length, and (5) rank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

An understanding of the way in which Coast Guard pilots view their careers is important to efficient aviation personnel management. Whether they consider themselves to be mostly pilots, officers, professionals, specialists, or something else, is important to the proper formulation of any number of personnel policies. One area in which this is particularly important is in the consideration of a Coast Guard limited duty officer aviator (LDO) program that has been proposed. As presently envisioned, participants in this program would be guaranteed assignments involving flight operations for their entire career, and would not advance in rank beyond lieutentant commander.

The purpose of this study is to examine the ways in which Coast Guard avaitors view their careers as officers and pilots. The objectives of the study are:

1. To determine the proportion of the Coast Guard aviator population that would be willing to participate in an LDO program.

2. If a sizable group is found, to examine its composition and determine what variables are related to the willingness to participate in such a program.

3. To make a cursory examination of the following related questions:

    a. Are potential program participants amenable to longer tours of duty?

    b. How important is achieving status as a pilot through advanced pilot ratings to the potential LDO?

c. Can willingness to participate in an LDO program (and therefore career orientation) be predicted by a vocational interest inventory?

Willingness to participate in a limited duty officer program would seem to be a function of whether an individual viewed his career in the Coast Guard as primarily that of a pilot or an officer, a professional specialist or a manager. The phenonmena of highly trained specialists functioning in bureaucratic organizations appears to be well described by the cosmopolitan/local model of career orientation developed by Alvin Gouldner at the University of Minnesota. This personnel model appears to be an appropriate one about which to structure this study.

A. BACKGROUND: THE OFFICER/PILOT DUALITY

One of the continuing sources of discussion and disagreement in military ready rooms everywhere is the dual role of the military aviator. An aviator must be both a quasi-technical specialist in the operation of his aircraft and execution of operational missions, and an administrator/manager in the performance of his collateral duties. While singly each of these roles could easily demand an officer's full attention, the military aviator is tasked with simultaneous performance of both. This can be a source of conflicting loyalties, unfair demands and frustration.

Of all the services, this problem is perhaps most readily apparent in the Coast Guard. While the aviation units of other

services are almost always located on large military bases and are surrounded by concentric layers of support, the administration of which is left to others, Coast Guard units are usually isolated from other military activities. Consequently, they must be responsible for a wide variety of self-support functions in addition to their operational missions. Coast Guard pilots much earlier in their careers are tasked with more demanding and less aviation-relevant collateral duties than their counterparts in other services as a result. This early initiation causes the operator/administrator role conflict to be both pronounced and virtually continous throughout a Coast Guard pilot's career.

Studies of other occupational groups, especially those commonly thought of as professions, have shown that these conditions often give rise to two distinct and identifiable job attitudes or orientations among the individuals involved. Some become more involved in their operational specialty, seeking achievement and job satisfaction through activities directly related to it. A commonly used example of this orientation is the medical doctor on the staff of a hospital whose sole interests are the healing of patients and the elimination of disease. He or she would typically identify much more with other doctors than with the hospital administration, be likely to submit articles to medical journals on a regular basis, and seek approval and status from peers. This type of orientation is commonly called "cosmopolitan."

On the other hand, some individuals identify more with their organization than their specialty. This orientation is usually called "local." To continue the doctor example, a "local" doctor would probably be less interested in perfecting the art of medicine and more in proper hospital administation and procedures. Rather than becoming widely known as a medical authority, the local doctor would seek to eventually become head of the hospital. It is important to note that the local and cosmopolitan doctors may not necessarily differ in medical competence. Where they do differ is in their attitudes toward their careers and in which arena they seek achievement, recognition and job satisfaction (Landsbury, 1978).

One of the methods of accommodating contrasting career orientations among professionals and specialists in many organizations has been the establishment of dual career paths. A scientist, for example, can often choose, at various points in his career, to either stay in research or move into management. Staying in research would mean promotions as a scientist, increased opportunities to do independent projects, gains in prestige through increases in professional competence, and the absence of most administrative duties. If a move into management was selected, the scientist would use his professional background in the administration of laboratories and management of research programs. When dual paths are available, individual career needs can be satisfied while at the same time the organization gains from more effective utilization of its human resources (Thompson, 1961).

Not all occupational groups are split with significant proportions of their membership having contrasting orientations. Studies have shown that almost all engineers, for example, envision themselves rising within the managerial (rather than professional) structure of their organizations at some point in their careers (Goldner and Ritti, 1970; Shepherd, 1961). Whether or not a significant division of locals and cosmopolitans exists in the field of aviation has never been shown or even addressed. This may be due in part to the fact that commercial pilots are rarely tasked with administrative duties and are employed exclusively in a cosmopolitan role, i.e., flying an aircraft. Similarly, military aviators are normally assigned primarily flight and flight-oriented responsibilities during their first few tours of duty. Traditionally high attrition among junior and mid-grade military pilots may leave only locals in the service. Indeed, there is some indication that those pilots most adept at controlling an aircraft tend to be those least well adapted to the military officer role and most likely to attrite (Rickus et. al., 1968). Retention studies (discussed in detail later) have also hinted that cosmopolitan personalities are more prone to leave the service. Thus it may be that the two major employers of pilots, the airline industry and the military, have relatively homogeneous populations of aviators with contrasting career orientations. The lack of opposing orientations within each group could explain the absence of work in this area.

Contrasting this view is the argument that the existence of dual career paths necessarily indicates coexistence of cosmopolitan and local orientations. The existence of the Army warrant officer and Navy limited duty officer programs for pilots might indicate that military pilots are indeed divided in the way they view their careers. However, these programs were probably established more as a method of resource allocation than to serve individuals' career aspirations. The existence of these programs might therefore be less of an indicator than appearances would suggest.

B. HYPOTHESES

In order to meet the stated objectives of the study and to examine related issues systematically, the following hypotheses will be examined.

1. Hypothesis 1

More than fifteen percent of the population are willing to participate in a limited duty officer program in which participants are not advanced in rank beyond lieutenant commander (referred to hereafter as simply "an LDO program").

The minimum participation required for the LDO program now under consideration by the Coast Guard is thirteen and one half percent (Holemon, 1980). Rounding this up to fifteen percent provides a degree of conservatism and respectable margin of error.

2. Hypothesis 2

Willingness to participate in an LDO program is a function of an individual's career orientation and varies directly with cosmopolitan traits.

Testing this hypothesis will also provide a test of the project's conceptual model. Although the model seems appropriate in every way, it may not be applicable to this particular situation or to the Coast Guard Aviator population.

3. Hypothesis 3

> Individuals that have not been selected on schedule for the next highest grade will be more likely to participate in an LDO program than others.

Specialty career paths offer alternate definitions of success to those within the organization who are either unwilling or unable to succeed in the conventional organizational terms of promotions and pay raises. An LDO program, then, should be more attractive to those officers who have not been routinely promoted with their peers. This is also an important issue as the attractiveness of the program to officers who have not been routinely promoted could seriously impact upon the credibility and desirability of the LDO program from the perspectives of both other potential participants and organizational decision makers.

4. Hypothesis 4

> Willingness to participate in an LDO program is a function of rank.

It would be expected that the longer an individual has been with an organization the more socialized into it he would become and the more he would identify with it. Similarly, it could be expected that individuals who have been more successful in organizational terms (promotions) will tend to identify with it more than others.

5. Hypothesis 5

> Willingness to participate in an LDO program is a function of commissioning source.

It is anticipated that career orientation, and therefore willingness to become an LDO, will vary with commissioning source because of the variance in socialization and organizational attachment between the several sources. Academy graduates, for example, experience a greater period of training and socialization than do other officers. It could be expected that they would tend to local career orientations and be less likely to want to participate in an LDO program. Aviators originally commissioned as officers and pilots in other services, however, would be expected to be oriented more as cosmopolitans. This, if for no other reason than that they have already left one organization while remaining in the same profession.

6. Hypothesis 6

> Individuals willing to participate in an LDO program prefer longer tours of duty than do other officers.

Geographic mobility in the military is associated with upward mobility in the organization. Individuals less concerned with upward mobility should therefore be more amenable to longer tours of duty, especially considering the financial hardships of relocation.

7. Hypothesis 7

> Achieving status as a pilot through advanced qualifications is significantly more important to potential LDOs than to others.

Assuming that the desire to become an LDO is a cosmopolitan trait, LDOs should prefer achievements within the field of flying more than their local counterparts.

8. Hypothesis 8

> Willingness to participate in an LDO program (and therefore career orientation) can be predicted using the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory.

Conflicting career orientations represent distinct sets of career interests. As the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory is designed to measure and distinguish between different career interests it should be able to discriminate between locals and cosmopolitans in the same profession.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of the literature reveals no work in the specific area of pilot career orientation. Much study has been done, however, of local and cosmopolitan orientations in other career fields and of military pilot job satisfaction and motiviation. In order to gain a proper background for this study, it is necessary to review work in both these areas.

In reviewing the literature it will be assumed that Coast Guard pilots do not differ significantly from pilots of other services in terms of motivation and job satisfaction. This is a fairly safe assumption as Coast Guard aviators are selected for training by the same criteria and tests used by other services and undergo flight training alongside their Navy and Marine counterparts. It is also a necessary assumption if motivational factors are to be considered in this study as few, if any, studies of Coast Guard pilots have been done.

A. CAREER ORIENTATION

The local/cosmopolitan phenomenon has been established by most writers as occurring primarily within professional groups (Francis and Stone, 1956; Gross, 1958; Corwin, 1961; Hall, 1968). Unfortunately there has been little agreement among sociologists as to what exactly constitutes a profession. In his review, for example, Landsbury cites some fifteen separate studies of occupations with as many definitions of "profession."

Several common elements were noticed, however, in most all of the definitions (Cogan, 1953; Vollmer and Mills, 1966). These were that a profession:

1. Is based on extensive training in a complex field of knowledge.

2. Involves practical application of that knowledge.

3. Is service oriented.

Using these criteria, military aviation could easily qualify as a profession. Flight training averages more than a year in length and is normally followed by a lengthy internship. Military pilots must be schooled in the elements of many disciplines (aerodynamics, structural dynamics, navigation, meteorology, etc.) in addition to the intricacies of the various missions they must perform. This knowledge is practically applied on a day to day basis in providing a service to the surface units they support and to the country as a whole.

It is not enough, however, to demonstrate that military aviation is a profession to conclude that it experiences a significant local/cosmopolitan division within its ranks. Many professions are made up almost exclusively of either all cosmopolitans or all locals. It is necessary, therefore, to examine the specific ways in which locals and cosmopolitans differ and determine if these differences are prevalent among military pilots.

The two opposing career orientations are almost always identified and defined principally in terms of their differences in the following areas:

Identity and Loyalty - Cosmopolitans tend to identify with their professional group, locals with their organizations. Cosmopolitan loyalty is therefore directed more toward colleagues and clients than the hierarchy of the organization. Thus cosmopolitans feel less compelled to support organizational policies, enforce and obey rules, and have few reservations about going outside the "chain of command" (Goldner and Ritti, 1970; Shepherd, 1961; Goldstein, 1958; Sorensen and Sorensen, 1974; Blau and Scott, 1962).

Mobility - Cosmopolitans are much more mobile than locals who are reluctant to sacrifice organizational knowledge and tenure by leaving the organization (Barber, 1965; Dalton, 1950).

Autonomy - Locals generally don't mind relatively close supervision and required adherence to organizational standards while cosmopolitans tend to chafe and balk at them (Kornhauser, 1952; Barber, 1965; Scott, 1968).

Professional Goals - The goals of the organization become the goals of the local. He is therefore more willing to take on a greater range of responsibilities and perform more diverse tasks. Cosmopolitans tend more to their own goals and those of their profession. Consequently they are very reluctant to perform tasks not directly related to the performance of their specialty (Corwin, 1961; Thompson, 1961; Gouldner, 1957; Merton, 1957: Bentz, 1950).

Recognition, Evaluation and Achievement - The cosmopolitan seeks success as a professional. He looks to his peer group

for recognition and approval. The organization is the source of the local's sense of job satisfaction. His achievement is measured in terms of promotions, pay raises, and increases in responsibility (Klatt, 1978; Goldner and Ritti, 1970).

Using these general areas as a guide, pilot motivation and job satisfaction literature can be correlated with what is known about career orientations.

B. PILOT MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION

1. General

Work in the area of pilot motivation and job satisfaction tends to be divided into two groups. One group consists of psychological studies examining various constructs of the aviator personality. Though many of these offer interesting propositions, such as a suggestion that aviation is a return to the womb because of the closed in ovalness of the fuselage, they offer little insight as to how aviators view their careers (Bond, 1952). Even those studies that have been done with accident prevention as their main goal offer little illumination. One notable exception to this is a study done by Fine and Hartman in 1968. In a report entitled "Psychiatric Strengths and Weaknesses of Typical Air Force Pilots," they comment upon career orientation directly. In describing their subjects they state:

> Career interests centered around achievement of competence in flying rather than impulsivity, raw pleasure, <u>or advancement in the organization</u>. (Emphasis added)

This would seem to be a very strong indicator of cosmopolitan tendencies within the population.

The second group of studies concern retention of military pilots and are regularly conducted, probably because of traditionally high attrition. These studies offer direct insights as to the attitudes of military pilots toward specific aspects of their jobs.

Using the format developed earlier, it can be shown that aviator retention studies reveal a high degree of "cosmopolitaness" among many pilots, especially those leaving the service.

2. Identity and Loyalty

Cosmopolitans identify more with their professional group than with their organization. That some military pilots identify more with aviation than their service is pointedly demonstrated by a 1978-79 survey of pilots leaving the Air Force (Carver, 1979). Significant numbers of this group stated that they "considered themselves pilots first and officers second." Over seventy percent stated they would seek jobs in aviation as civilians. Further evidence of primary identification with aviation was uncovered by a 1966 Navy survey that showed a pronounced "preference for a strictly pilot/flight officer career path as opposed to that of an unrestricted line officer" among thirty-six percent of all the active duty pilots and flight officers polled (Robertson, 1966).

All pilots enjoy flying. Directly associating continuous flight duty and the value of a career, though, is probably

the sign of a cosmopolitan pilot. A 1980 survey of resigning Air Force pilots shows that the inability to fly an entire career was a major factor in this group's leaving the service (Carver, 1980). In another study, seventy-four percent of Marine aviators stated they would "be encouraged to resign" by a non-flying tour of duty (Millard, 1979). The Navy obtained similar results in a 1980 study that found "sufficient flight time (both quantity and quality)..." among the most frequently mentioned factors in pilots' decisions to remain in the service. Conversely it was found that "insufficient flight time (both quantity and quality)..." was a major factor in decisions to leave the service (Sheposh et. al., 1980).

3. Mobility

A greater tendency to change organizations is a recognized trait of cosmopolitans. The mobility of military pilots has been repeatedly demonstrated, at least in their propensity to leave the service. The Navy, for example, lost forty-eight percent of its pilots in 1977. This figure increased to sixty-nine percent in 1979 (NAVPERS, 1979). The Air Force also lost forty-eight percent in 1977 and increased its rate to seventy-three percent in 1979 (Gulick and Lackman, 1980). While other factors may have influenced this high attrition, it is still an indicator of a high degree of mobility.

4. Autonomy

Cosmopolitans tend to have a greater need to work independently than their local co-workers. This attribute is

not specifically revealed in any of the retention studies. This may be because a pilot's job is intriniscally autonomous. Thus a lack of autonomy would not be a significant factor in a decision to leave the service. Several works do, however, cite the individual's lack of control over his future assignments and career in general as demotivating elements and contributors to attrition (Carver, 1979: Millard, 1979; Matthews et. al., 1978). Though this lack of autonomy in career decisions does not apply to the work itself, it may serve as an indicator of cosmopolitan tendencies.

5. Professional Goals

The cosmopolitan tends to pursue his own goals and those of his profession rather than those of the organization. He is less willing to perform tasks outside his specialty area. Two studies of resigning pilots show some evidence of this among military pilots. A 1978 Navy study found that many resignees felt that the needs of the service prevailed unjustly over the needs of the individual (Day, 1979). Resigning Air Force officers shared this feeling (Carver, 1980) and added that their concern for mission readiness did not seem to be shared by senior officers. This same group cited non-aviation related collateral duties as demotivating.

6. Recognition, Evaluation, Achievement

Two studies show that many military pilots have cosmopolitan traits in this area. Resigning Air Force pilots indicated that part of their dissatisfaction with the service

arose with their not being evaluated on their performance as pilots, but rather on miscellaneous collateral duties that were secondary responsibilities (Carver, 1979). A psychological study of Air Force pilots cited earlier also found pilots' achievement motivation to be centered about increased proficiency as an aviator (Fine and Hartman, 1968).

C. CONCLUSION

From the literature available, it can probably be concluded that a significant portion of the military aviator population hold what can be considered cosmopolitan career orientations. The fact that studies of attriting pilots and their reasons for resigning revealed most of the cosmopolitan tendencies, coupled with the organizational success of numerous pilots in the military, provides very strong evidence that many locally oriented pilots exist as well.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. GENERAL

A questionnaire was sent to each of the approximately 850 designated aviators (not including flag officers) serving in the U.S. Coast Guard. The purpose of the survey was to examine cosmopolitan and local career orientations and other related issues among the aviator population. Literature on similar surveys done within other occupational groups suggested many of the survey questions as well as a consistant scoring methodology (Goldner and Ritti, 1970; Sorensen and Sorensen, 1974). One hundred forty copies of the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory (SCII) were included with questionnaires sent to pilots at several randomly selected units. This was done in the expectation that the vocational interests of cosmopolitan and local pilots would differ significantly and that the SCII results would reinforce those of the questionnaire.

B. SAMPLE

Eight hundred forty-six questionnaires were mailed to individual Coast Guard aviators (the entire population). Of these, 696 were returned completed within three months and were included in the analysis. Sixteen more were returned as undeliverable and one was returned completed but late. This gave a questionnaire response rate of eighty-four percent.

Of the 140 Strong-Campbell Interest Inventories mailed, 103 were returned completed and one returned as undeliverable for a response rate of seventy-four percent. This lower rate was probably due to the additional time (about forty-five minutes) required to complete the SCII.

Judging from the distribution of the biographical data obtained from respondents, non-respondents appeared to have been randomly distributed throughout the population.

C. INSTRUMENTS

1. The Questionnaire

The questionnaire is made up of sixty-four items divided between two sections. Thirty-three of the items are for the purpose of collecting biographical data and comprise the first section entitled "Background Information." The second section, "Opinion and Interest Survey," is made up of the remaining thirty-one items (SURV01 to SURV31) which seek to measure attitudes towards various aspects of a Coast Guard aviation career on five point Likert scales. A copy of the questionnaire annotated for scoring is included as Appendix A. The questionnaire items fall into six major categories. Four of these correspond to areas in which cosmopolitans and locals are known to differ. The remaining two collect background and related information.

a. Question Categories

Background and Introductory - A large amount of biographical information is sought. This includes information on educational background, career experience, and off duty

flight activity. Three "warm up" questions concerning career intentions (retire/resign) and motivation upon joining the service are asked at the beginning of the "Opinion and Interest" section.

Mobility - Four items address the individual's propensity to change jobs. Three of these pertain to work history and are included in the "Background Information" section (items 7, 31, and 33). The fourth item (SURV20) questions the individual's willingness to leave the Coast Guard in order to continue flight activity.

Evaluation - Two items (SURV06 and SURV26) address the manner in which the performance of Coast Guard aviators is evaluated.

Professional Goals and Area of Achievement - Nine items (SURV05, 07, 10, 12, 17, 21, 24, 27, 29) deal with this subject. The desirability of various jobs and tasks (professional goals) and individual aspirations for cosmopolitan and local type achievements are addressed.

Tour Length - Opinions concerning the proper length of a tour of duty at an aviation unit are sought in two items (SURV04 and SURV16).

Identity and Loyalty - The remainder of the items address how the individual identifies with aviation as a general profession and with the Coast Guard as an organization.

The last two items in the questionnaire ask the individual's willingness to participate in a limited duty

aviation career path with limitations on promotion. It is hypothesized that participation in such a program constitutes cosmopolitan behavior and as such will be highly correlated with cosmopolitan-like responses on other items.

b. Scoring

Item responses are recorded as single numerical digits. With the exception of the three "warm up" questions, item responses from the "Opinion and Interest" section are scored with values from one to five corresponding to points on the Likert scale. These items are scored so that high numerical values (4's and 5's) are assigned responses that would normally be associated with local career orientations while low values (1's and 2's) are assigned to cosmopolitan-like ones.

2. <u>The Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory</u>

The Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory is a published vocational interest test of unusually high validity. Its basis is empirical sampling of numerous occupational groups from many fields. By comparing the responses of an individual with the known responses of individuals in various occupations the test can be used to counsel a subject concerning a vocational choice. The test results provide standardized scores for individuals for Holland's six occupational themes, twenty-three basic occupational interest areas, and 183 specific vocations (see Table 1). The instrument has been shown to have high reliability (>70% after two weeks and >60% after two years) as well as having significant concurrent validity (Campbell, 1977).

Table 1

SCII Occupational Themes and Interest Areas

Holland's Six Themes	Music/Dramatics
	Art
Realistic	Writing
Investigative	Teaching
Artistic	Social Science
Social	Athletics
Enterprising	Domestic Arts
Conventional	Religious Activities
	Public Speaking
Basic Interest Scales	Law/Politics
	Merchandising
Agriculture	Sales
Nature	Business Management
Adventure	Office Practices
Military Activities	Science
Mechanical Activities	Mathematics
Medical Service	Medical Science

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

A. GENERAL

1. Data Processing

Data was processed and analyzed using the Naval Postgraduate School IBM 3330 computer system and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie et. al., 1975). Because of the high response rate and as the entire population was surveyed by the questionnaire, the need for statistical inference from the sample was eliminated. The data sample set was large enough to be regarded as constituting responses from the entire population.

Data was compiled from returned surveys by the voice to disk method using equipment at the NPS man-machine laboratory and the IBM 3330 computer system. Sample checks indicated an input error rate of less than one percent for the voice to disk system. The input format and method also allowed a cursory check of the data after transcription from the questionnaire and before final recording on the disk. As the range of possible responses for most items was limited to five values or less, a final check on input accuracy was made. This was done by insuring that all recorded responses were within the permissible region for their respective items. Although this was admittedly only a partial check, it added support to the high accuracy found by sampling as only nine characters of 46,632 were found to be recorded improperly.

2. Defining "Willingness to Participate"

Defining "willingness to participate in an LDO program" is a crucial part of the analysis. For the purpose of evaluating the first two hypotheses, this will be defined as a response in the block closest to "would" on item SURV31 (reproduced below). This will give the most conservative estimate of the number of potential LDOs and the program's potential effect at the lieutenant commander to commander promotion point.

In considering the other hypotheses, willingness to participate in an LDO program will be considered to be reflected by the sum of the scored responses to items SURV30 and SURV31. This sum will constitute a new, nine value (2-10) variable designated COMB. This new variable, through its expanded scale, will be able to reflect more degrees of willingness to participate while at the same time permitting better correlational and regression analysis where required.

30) I __________ participate in a program whereby pilots were guaranteed to stay in flying billets their entire career.

Would ☐ (1) ☐ (2) ☐ (3) ☐ (4) ☐ (5) Would not

31. I __________ participate in the above mentioned program even if it meant not being promoted beyond Lieutenant Commander.

Would ☐ (1) ☐ (2) ☐ (3) ☐ (4) ☐ (5) Would not

Note: Scoring numbers in parentheses did not appear on the surveys completed by respondents.

Figure 1: Items SURV30 and SURV31

B. EVALUATION OF HYPOTHESES

1. Hypothesis 1

More than fifteen percent of the population would be willing to participate in a limited duty officer program in which participants would not advance in rank beyond lieutenant commander.

For the purposes of this hypothesis, willingness to participate in an LDO program is considered to be indicated by responses in only the left-most block of item SURV31. Even making this very conservative assumption 18.8 percent of the respondents (130 individuals) are found to be potential program participants (see Figures 2 and 3).

SURV31 I ______ participate in the above mentioned program even if it meant not being promoted to lieutenant commander.

Category Label	Code	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (Pct.)	Adjusted Freq. (Pct.)	Cum Freq. (Pct.)
Would	1.	130	18.7	18.8	18.8
	2.	75	10.8	10.8	29.6
	3.	80	11.5	11.5	41.1
	4.	82	11.8	11.8	53.0
Would not	5.	326	46.8	47.0	100.0
	9.	3	0.4	Missing	100.0
	Total	696	100.0	100.0	

Figure 2: Frequency table for responses to item SURV31

Another, and perhaps more valid, approach is to examine only the replies of lieutenants and lieutenant commanders as it would be this group that would most likely be called upon to decide whether or not to participate in an LDO program. In addition to being the "target group" the responses of lieutenants and lieutenant commanders are probably more credible than those of other officers. This is because officers junior to this group are less likely to be fully socialized into Coast

Guard aviation while the responses of more senior officers are necessarily retrospective and probably subject to inaccuracies.

Breaking down the replies to item SURV31 by rank it is found that lieutenants and lieutenant commanders responding on the far left of the Likert scale constitute eleven percent of the aviator population overall. More significantly, though, of the 380 lieutenants and lieutenant commanders surveyed, seventy-six, or twenty percent, strongly indicate they would participate in an LDO program (see Figure 4). This seems to indicate more than enough interest required from the target group to permit establishment of such a program.

```
SURV31     I________ PARTICIPATE IN THE ABOVE MENTIONED
           PROGRAM EVEN IF IT MEANT NOT BEING PROMOTED BEYOND
           LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.
-      CODE
            I
         1. ************* (   130)
            I  WOULD
            I
            I
         2. ******** (   75)
            I
            I
            I
         3. ******** (   80)
            I
            I
            I
         4. ******** (   82)
            I
            I
            I
         5. ********************************* (   326)
            I  WOULD NOT
            I
            I
         9. * (    3)
 (MISSING)  I
            I
            I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
            0        100       200       300       400       500
            FREQUENCY
0
MEAN          3.576     STD ERR      0.060     MEDIAN       4.250
MODE          5.000     STD DEV      1.591     VARIANCE     2.531
KURTOSIS     -1.298     SKEWNESS    -0.570     RANGE        4.000
MINIMUM       1.000     MAXIMUM      5.000

VALID CASES     693     MISSING CASES    3
```

Figure 3: Frequency Distribution and Related Statistics for Responses to Item SURV31

RANK	SURV31	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	WOULD 1.	2.	3.	4.	WOULD NOT 5.	ROW TOTAL
ENS	1.	COUNT	3	2	1	0	0	6
		ROW PCT	50.0	33.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.9
		COL PCT	2.3	2.7	1.3	0.0	0.0	
		TOT PCT	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	
LTJG	2.	COUNT	37	17	9	15	33	111
		ROW PCT	33.3	15.3	8.1	13.5	29.7	16.0
		COL PCT	28.5	22.7	11.3	18.3	10.1	
		TOT PCT	5.3	2.5	1.3	2.2	4.8	
LTO3	3.	COUNT	50	25	34	27	61	197
		ROW PCT	25.4	12.7	17.3	13.7	31.0	28.4
		COL PCT	38.5	33.3	42.5	32.9	18.7	
		TOT PCT	7.2	3.6	4.9	3.9	8.8	
LCDR	4.	COUNT	26	18	23	24	92	183
		ROW PCT	14.2	9.8	12.6	13.1	50.3	26.4
		COL PCT	20.0	24.0	28.8	29.3	28.2	
		TOT PCT	3.8	2.6	3.3	3.5	13.3	
CDR	5.	COUNT	11	9	11	15	90	136
		ROW PCT	8.1	6.6	8.1	11.0	66.2	19.6
		COL PCT	8.5	12.0	13.8	18.3	27.6	
		TOT PCT	1.6	1.3	1.6	2.2	13.0	
CAPT	6.	COUNT	3	4	2	1	50	60
		ROW PCT	5.0	6.7	3.3	1.7	83.3	8.7
		COL PCT	2.3	5.3	2.5	1.2	15.3	
		TOT PCT	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.1	7.2	
COLUMN TOTAL			130	75	80	82	326	693
			18.8	10.8	11.5	11.8	47.0	100.0

MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

Figure 4: Breakdown of Responses to Item SURV31 by Rank

a. A Related Question

The officer personnel structure of Coast Guard Aviation is such that there exists a relatively large number of junior officer (duty standing and flying) billets and a relatively small number of senior officer (command and control) billets. Because of this, competition for promotion to senior officer rank is much keener among aviators than is experienced by other specialty groups. An LDO aviator program could help to normalize this competition by removing a portion of the

population from consideration for promotion to senior officer rank. It is important to ask, therefore, what effect, if any, an LDO program would have on officer promotion.

To determine the effect of an LDO program on the promotion system, additional analysis is necessary. This is because many of the potential LDOs are fairly junior officers with relatively large amounts of credited service time either from enlisted experience or service in another branch of the military. Many of these officers will certainly retire before competing for promotion to commander under the present system. This group can not, therefore, be considered when examining an LDO program's effect on competition for promotion to commander.

For the purposes of this analysis the following, mostly conservative, assumptions are made:

1. Only those persons responding to item SURV31 (reproduced below) in the left-most block of the Likert scale would participate in an LDO program.

31. I ______ participate in the above mentioned program even if it meant not being promoted beyond Lieutenant Commander.

Would ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Would <u>not</u>

Figure 5: Item SURV31

2. The responses of commanders and captains to item SURV31 are unreliable and should not be considered (this eliminates 196 of the 696 respondents).

3. All officers with twenty years of service who have not been selected for promotion to commander will retire.

4. Consideration and selection for promotion to commander takes place six months before actual promotion.

5. All officers have at least one year of service in grade (this is necessary as time in grade survey responses are all scored at a minimum of one year).

6. The time between promotions listed in Table 2 are relatively invariant.

7. No potential LDOs will fail of selection under the present system before being considered for promotion to commander.

Table 2
Times Between Promotions

ENS to CDR	14 yrs. 8 mos.
LTJG to CDR	13 yrs. 2 mos.
LT to CDR	10 yrs. 5 mos.
LCDR to CDR	5 yrs. 6 mos.

(Source: U.S. Coast Guard Commandant's Bulletin 29-81)

Using these assumptions, the number of officers who would be program participants and who would have otherwise been eligible for consideration for promotion to commander can be sought. This is done by computing a new variable, COMPETE, for each program participant as illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3
Computation of Variable COMPETE

COMPETE = 20 - YRSERV - (TCDR - YRSINGRD)

Where: 20 = Number of years service required for retirement.

YRSERV = Individual's present years of service.

TCDR = Number of years (rounded to the nearest whole year) between promotion to the individual's present rank and consideration for promotion to commander. Figures taken from Table 1 less six months to allow for selection/promotion lag.

YRSINGRD = Individual's number of years service in present grade (rank).

Individuals with negative values of COMPETE will not be considered for promotion to commander before retirement under the present system while those with positive values will. A value of zero can be considered to place an individual in the "will not be considered" group as requests for retirement must be submitted a minimum of six months in advance.

Sixty-five percent of the potential LDOs, or seventy-six individuals, will be eligible for consideration for promotion to commander under the present system prior to having twenty years of service (see Figure 6). This means that of the 500 lieutenant commander and more junior officers in the population, 15.2 percent would be removed from competition for commander by an LDO program. This is an extremely conservative figure as many officers not considered as potential LDOs will certainly retire before being considered for commander. The seventy-six individuals removed from consideration, then, would be a larger part of a smaller group.

CATEGORY LABEL		CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
		-9.	1	0.9	0.9	0.9
		-8.	2	1.7	1.7	2.6
		-7.	1	0.9	0.9	3.4
		-5.	3	2.6	2.6	6.0
		-4.	3	2.6	2.6	8.6
COMPETE		-3.	6	5.2	5.2	13.8
		-2.	3	2.6	2.6	16.4
		-1.	11	9.5	9.5	25.9
		0.	10	8.6	8.6	34.5
		1.	8	6.9	6.9	41.4
		2.	13	11.2	11.2	52.6
		3.	4	3.4	3.4	56.0
VALID CASES	116	4.	7	6.0	6.0	62.1
		5.	16	13.8	13.8	75.9
		6.	24	20.7	20.7	96.6
MISSING CASES	0	7.	4	3.4	3.4	100.0
		TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.000	STD ERR	0.353	MEDIAN	2.269
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	3.802	VARIANCE	14.452
KURTOSIS	-0.100	SKEWNESS	-0.731	RANGE	16.000
MINIMUM	-9.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

Figure 6: Values of COMPETE for Potential LDOs

2. Hypothesis 2

> Willingness to participate in an LDO program is a function of an individual's career orientation and varies directly with cosmopolitan traits.

A stepwise regression analysis can be used to examine which questionnaire items are related to an individual's willingness to participate in an LDO program. Regression is an appropriate method of analysis as both career orientation and willingness to be an LDO are best expressed in terms of a continuum with many "shades of grey" between the poles of cosmopolitan/LDO and local/unrestricted line officer.

The dependent variable in the analysis will be the variable COMB which is simply the summed scored responses to items SURV30 and SURV31 (reproduced below).

30. I ______ participate in a program whereby pilots were guaranteed to stay in flying billets their entire career.

Would ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Would <u>not</u>

31. I _____ participate in the above mentioned program even if it meant not being promoted beyond Lieutenant Commander.

Would ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Would <u>not</u>

Figure 7: Items SURV30 and SURV31

All of the items in the questionnaire can be used as independent variables in the analysis with the exception of items SURV30, SURV31, and SURV15. Items SURV30 and SURV31 can not, of course, be included as they are used to construct the dependent variable. Item SURV15 can not be used because of its great similarity to item SURV31.

Only those independent variables that contribute to the regression at the .01 level of significance (F=6.63) or better will be included in the analysis.

Fifty-nine percent of the variance in the data is explained by the regression and a multiple R of .77 is evidenced (see Figure 9). Of the eight variables contributing to the regression the first (most important) six are items from the "Opinion and Interest" section of the questionnaire. These are reproduced below and have been annotated with their scoring scheme.

As was expected, how an individual identifies himself on a continuum from officer to pilot has the single greatest ability to predict his willingness to participate in an LDO program. Since identification was the most dominant theme found in other studies (see for example Gouldner, 1957; Merton, 1957; or Bentz, 1950) this fits well with what has been found by others. It also provides convincing evidence that participation in a specialist career path is cosmopolitan behavior.

The next five variables support the contention that participation in a specialist career path is cosmopolitan behavior as they deal with two constructs important in distinguishing cosmopolitan and locals - professional goals and area of achievement. Items SURV05, SURV22 and SURV14 all deal with the desirability of job attributes (professional goals) that might be encountered by a Coast Guard pilot. Items SURV21 and SURV29 address the relative importance of local and cosmopolitan

type goals. Although two demographic variables contribute to the regression also, it is important to note that the six "Opinion and Interest" section variables by themselves predict fifty-seven percent of the variance and achieve a multiple R of .756.

28. To what extent do you think of your career as the career of a Coast Guard officer or that of a Coast Guard pilot?

Mostly as a Pilot ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Mostly as an Officer

5. I dislike the idea of being assigned to a non-flying staff job during my career.

Strongly Agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly Disagree

——— Please indicate how important each of the following things are to you in your career. ———

21. Becoming a unit X.O. or C.O.

Very Important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very Unimportant

22. Flying Coast Guard aircraft.

Very Important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very Unimportant

29. If the Coast Guard wide designations were extablished, I would be ________ in becoming a unit instructor pilot, flight examiner, or instrument examiner.

Very Interested ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very Uninterested

14. I dislike paperwork _______ than most other Coast Guard pilots.

Much More ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Much Less

Figure 8: The six Opinion and Interest items in the regression

SPSS BATCH SYSTEM 11/12/81 PAGE 25

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

SUMMARY TABLE

VARIABLE		MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	RSQ CHANGE	SIMPLE R	B	F	BETA
SURV28	CAREER OF PILOT OR OFFICER	0.56986	0.32474	0.32474	0.56986	0.3665317	30.804	0.17627
SURV05	DISLIKE IDEA OF NON-FLY STAFF JOB	0.66608	0.44366	0.11892	0.55625	0.5373109	99.427	0.29093
SURV21	IMPORT OF BEING XO OR CO	0.70153	0.49215	0.04849	0.40408	0.4230816	66.129	0.22963
SURV22	IMPORT OF FLYING CG ACFT	0.72960	0.53232	0.04018	0.38350	0.5042342	39.606	0.18225
SURV29	IN BECOMING UNIT INSTR PILOT	0.74571	0.55608	0.02376	0.37893	0.2801184	24.393	0.13772
SURV14	DISLIKE PAPERWK___THAN OTHERS	0.75567	0.57104	0.01497	0.40471	0.3587809	20.087	0.12351
RANK	RANK	0.76421	0.58402	0.01297	0.38104	0.2420985	14.548	0.10773
CGA	CGA	0.77007	0.59301	0.00899	0.25013	0.5379496	14.226	0.09927
(CONSTANT)						-1.932053		

MULTIPLE R	0.77007
R SQUARE	0.59301
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.58795
STANDARD ERROR	1.72216

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	8.	2782.95882	347.86985	117.29263
RESIDUAL	644.	1909.99371	2.96583	

Figure 9: Summary of Regression Analysis Results

3. <u>Hypothesis 3</u>

> Individuals who have not been selected on schedule for the next higher rank will be more willing to participate in an LDO program than others.

"Willingness to participate" can again be defined as an individual's score on the nine value variable COMB. Individuals who haved failed of selection can be defined as those who have times in grade of a year or more beyond what would normally be expected for their particular rank (see Table 2). Although exclusion of those passed over for promotion within a year may eliminate some individuals from the analysis who had only recently failed of selection at the time of the survey, it also helps prevent the initial emotional reaction to it from becoming an extraneous variable in the study.

Fourteen respondents were not selected on time for promotion to the next higher rank. Five of these are lieutenants and nine are lieutenant commanders. Z tests (t with d.f.$=\infty$) can be used to compare the COMB scores of the "failed of selection group" to those of the aviation population generally and to those of other lieutenants and lieutenant commanders (see Figure 10).

No significant difference in willingness to participate in an LDO program was found between the failed of selection group and either the population generally or the lieutenant/lieutenant commander group. The data does not support the hypothesis.

	GROUP 1 Passed over officers	GROUP 2 General population	GROUP 3 Lieutenants and Lieutenant Commanders
n	14	696	382
$\bar{X}$	5.071	5.916	5.709
σ^2	6.841	7.260	7.330

Test Statistic Formula:

$$Z = \frac{(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

d.f. $= \infty$

$Z_{.005} = 2.576$

$Z_{.01} = 2.326$

A. Ho: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$ or - There is no significant difference at the .01 level between the replies of the passed over group and the general aviator population.

$Z = 1.196$ Fail to reject the null hypothesis.

B. Ho: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$ or - There is no significant difference at the .01 level between the replies of the passed over group and other lieutenants and lieutenant commanders.

$Z = .8953$ Fail to reject the null hypothesis.

Figure 10: Computation of Z Statistics for Hypothesis 3

4. Hypothesis 4

Willingness to participate in an LDO program is a function of rank.

To examine this hypothesis it is only necessary to review the analysis in Figure 9. The rank variable makes a significant, independent contribution to the regression equation for willingness to become an LDO. Its B value is also positive, demonstrating that the higher the rank the lower the tendency to want to be an LDO.

In order to eliminate from the analysis what might be the undue influence of senior officer replies, a Pearson

correlation between RANK and COMB (willingness to participate) was computed using only the junior four grades (ensign to lieutenant commander). Though the correlation between the two falls from .38104 to .2418, the correlation remains significant at better than the .01 level.

It can safely be concluded that the data support the hypothesis.

5. Hypothesis 5

Willingness to participate in an LDO program is a function of commissioning source.

The regression analysis in Figure 9 also supports this hypothesis. Coast Guard Academy commissioning source, is a contributor to the equation with a positive B value. This confirms the expectation that academy graduates would be less likely to want to participate in an LDO program and that commissioning source is an important factor. It is important to note that although it is the last variable included in the analysis and its contribution to R squared fairly small, commissioning source does make a significant, independent contribution to the equation at better than the .01 level.

6. Hypothesis 6

Individuals willing to participate in an LDO program prefer longer tours of duty than do other officers.

The correlation coefficient between the willingness to participate variable, (COMB), and desired tour length as evidenced in item SURV16 is highly significant (.001), though the coefficient is relatively small (.2069). The hypothesis is supported, though not particularly robustly.

```
SURV04     WITH THE EXCEPTION OF OUT OF CONUS TOURS, I FEEL THAT THE
           AVERAGE TOUR LENGTH SHOULD AT PRESENT BE:

             I
        1.   ********************************************** (    449)
             I  LONGER
             I
             I
        2.   ************************ (    234)
             I  ABOUT THE SAME
             I
             I
        3.   ** (     5)
             I  SHORTER
             I
             I
        9.   ** (     8)
   (MISSING) I
             I
             I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
             0        100       200       300       400       500
             FREQUENCY

 MEAN           1.355      STD ERR        0.019      MEDIAN          1.266
 MODE           1.000      STD DEV        0.494      VARIANCE        0.244
 KURTOSIS      -0.929      SKEWNESS       0.790      RANGE           2.000
 MINIMUM        1.000      MAXIMUM        3.000

 VALID CASES      688      MISSING CASES      8

SURV16     I FEEL THAT, GENERALLY, THE BEST TOUR LENGTH FOR AN
           AVIATION DUTY STANDER AT AN AIR STATION IS:

             I
        1.   ******** (     68)
             I  6 YEARS OR MORE
             I
             I
        2.   ************** (    133)
             I  5 YEARS
             I
             I
        3.   *************************************** (    380)
             I  FOUR YEARS
             I
             I
        4.   ************ (    108)
             I  THREE YEARS
             I
             I
        5.   ** (     5)
             I  TWO YEARS OR LESS
             I
             I
        9.   * (     2)
   (MISSING) I
             I
             I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
             0        100       200       300       400       500
             FREQUENCY

 MEAN           2.782      STD ERR        0.032      MEDIAN          2.884
 MODE           3.000      STD DEV        0.850      VARIANCE        0.722
 KURTOSIS       0.048      SKEWNESS      -0.461      RANGE           4.000
 MINIMUM        1.000      MAXIMUM        5.000

 VALID CASES      694      MISSING CASES      2
```

Figure 11: Frequency Table for Population's Responses to Items SURV04 and SURV16

One reason this relationship is not as pronounced as it might be, may be the overwhelming preference among the entire population for longer tours of duty. Eighty-five percent of all the respondents indicated preference for tours of duty longer than the three year standard now in effect.

7. Hypothesis 7

> Achieving status as a pilot through advanced qualifications is significantly more important to potential LDOs than to others.

To affirm this hypothesis it is only necessary to refer once again to the regression analysis in Figure 9. One of the most prestigious advanced qualifications is that of instructor pilot, and interest in becoming a unit instructor pilot (SURV29) is a significant predictor of willingness to become an LDO.

8. Hypothesis 8

> Willingness to participate in an LDO program (and therefore career orientation) can be predicted using the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory.

Defining willingness to participate as an individual's value of COMB, regression analyses can be done with COMB as the dependent variable and SCII scores as the independent variables. As SPSS regression analysis is limited to the consideration of 100 independent variables at a time, two regressions are initially required. One, including the scores on the six Holland occupational themes and twenty-three basic interest areas as independent variables, and the other using the ninety-one scores for males in specific vocations. Using the variables found in these first two analyses as independent variables for a third

regression, the overall predictive ability of the SCII can be found.

The results of this last regression show SCII scores explaining only twenty-five percent of the variance in COMB while achieving a multiple R of .5 (see Figure 12). These results are obtained with a significance level of .05, marginally supporting the hypothesis.

An explanation for these modest results may lie in the fact that the SCII is designed to differentiate between professions rather than professional subgroups. It is quite possible that the career interests of locals and cosmopolitans in the same profession are not divergent enough to be detected with the SCII. This could be particularly true in this case as the SCII manual lists the same vocational interest constructs as applying to both pilot and Navy officer careers.

SPSS BATCH SYSTEM 11/04/81 PAGE 8

FILE SCII (CREATION DATE = 10/05/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 2

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

SUMMARY TABLE

VARIABLE	F	MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	RSQ CHANGE	SIMPLE R	B	BETA
STSCR044	1.694	0.25124	0.06312	0.06312	-0.25124	-0.1165833D-01	-0.12041
STSCR152	10.514	0.32173	0.10351	0.04039	0.24821	0.2779052D-01	0.30059
STSCR122	9.703	0.38834	0.15081	0.04730	-0.20925	-0.2539963D-01	-0.28200
STSCR108	6.921	0.44363	0.19681	0.04600	-0.19511	-0.2047272D-01	-0.23964
STSCR026	6.896	0.50012	0.25012	0.05331	0.16607	0.2308372D-01	0.23779
(CONSTANT)						5.414095	

MULTIPLE R	0.50012
R SQUARE	0.25012
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.21146
STANDARD ERROR	2.33971

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	5.	177.11275	35.42255	6.47074
RESIDUAL	97.	531.00376	5.47427	

Figure 12: Regression Analysis Results Using COMB and SCII Scores

V. CONCLUSION

A. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The cosmopolitan and local career orientations that are so evident in other professions also appear to exist in the Coast Guard aviator population (this probably is also true for military pilots generally). These career orientations, as might be expected, are directly related to an individual's willingness to participate in a limited duty officer career path.

Analysis of survey data reveals that a minimum of twenty percent of the aviator lieutenants and lieutenant commanders would participate in an LDO program. This would meet the organization's goal of reducing the number of pilots competing for promotion to commander. More than fifteen percent of the pilots that will be considered for promotion to commander under the present system would participate in an LDO program and thereby remove themselves from the competition.

Willingness to participate in an LDO program is directly related to career orientation, rank, commissioning source, and interest in becoming a unit instructor pilot. There is also a relationship between willingness to become an LDO and perceived optimal tour length. This last relationship, though significant, is slight, as a great majority of all survey respondents preferred longer tours of duty.

Officers that had not been selected for the next higher rank on schedule are surprisingly no more willing to participate in an LDO program than are others.

Finally, the SCII appears to be unable to predict career orientation or willingness to become an LDO. This may be a function of the instrument or it could be that cosmopolitans and locals do not differ in vocational interests significantly.

B. AN LDO PROGRAM

There is a great amount of interest among the Coast Guard aviator population in the general question of career orientation and the specific proposal of an LDO aviator program. This interest is evidenced by the exceptionally high response rate. That there are sufficient numbers of pilots willing to participate in such a program is probably beyond question. Whether any given program would succeed in practice, however, is an entirely different issue. Should an LDO aviator program be established, its success or failure will hinge on its ability to satisfy the needs of both the organization <u>and the individual</u>.

From the organization's point of view the main advantage of an LDO aviator program is probably its effect in normalizing the officer promotion system. Although having a "hard core" of professional aviators might also be attractive, especially in regard to accident prevention and mission effectiveness, its benefits are difficult to predict and quantify and would probably not be a significant consideration. As is evident in the examination of hypothesis 1, an LDO program could easily

meet the organization's goal of reducing competition among aviators for promotion to commander. Such a program would only succeed in doing this, however, if it had sufficient participation. This study demonstrates that sufficient numbers of potential participants exist in the population. The number of aviators that might actually participate in any given LDO program, though, would be a function of that program's structure, opportunities, and ability to satisfy the career aspirations of the individual participants.

C. PROGRAM STRUCTURE

This study, associated literature, narrative replies appended to returned surveys, and personal contact with other aviators during the course of this project have shown several elements that are probably essential to the success of an LDO aviator program, should one be established.

1. Expectations

Prior to entering the program, participants should be fully aware of the demands that would be placed on them as LDOs. Although LDOs would probably be assigned less demanding and more flight-oriented collateral duties, using this as a selling point of the program could raise false hopes and cause later disillusionment. The administrative load at many air units requires the attention of all pilots assigned under the present system. Exempting part of the staff from even part of these duties could cause unreasonable demands to be placed on others,

as well as to generate a certain degree of animosity. As a minimum, LDOs would have to expect to do their fair share of routine audits, investigations, reports, and inventories. While it could be a good policy to assign LDOs primarily to departments in which their aviation expertise could be utilized, i.e., operations, engineering, training, safety, it would most certainly be a mistake to create the expectation that LDOs would only "fly and go home."

A selection for the LDO aviator career path should not be made to evade responsibilities but rather to bring the primary scope of those responsibilities more into line with career interests. Officers selecting the LDO career path should realize they would still be required to assist the command in some non-aviation areas.

2. Requirements and Evaluation

Performance requirements for LDOs should be as rigorous as those for other officers, though oriented more about aviation duties. LDOs should be expected to be especially proficient in maneuvering their aircraft and should be more familiar with aircraft systems, operations, and capabilities than might be expected of the average, high quality pilot. Minimum acceptable scores on the annual standardization and proficiency team exam should be established for LDOs. To reinforce this effort, the degree to which an LDO contributes to the overall aviation professionalism and proficiency of the command through the performance of his flight and collateral duties should be addressed in performance evaluations.

To be less demanding of LDOs than of other officers would be both to miss a great opportunity and to doom the program to failure. Without high performance requirements the opportunity to establish a "hard core" of highly skilled and professional aviators would be lost. People tend to perform as they are expected to perform. If only routine aviation competence was expected of LDOs only routine competence would be achieved. The establishment of an LDO program would identify a group of pilots as different from the general population. It would take very little reinforcement either way to make this difference a mark of excellence or a social stigma. Stringent performance requirements would insure that the LDOs would become the "professionals' professionals."

Not assuring such high standards for LDOs could also easily lead to failure of the program. If LDOs were only run-of-the-mill pilots their only real distinction in the service would be that they did not get promoted as quickly or as far as everyone else. This distinction could easily lead to a "loser" syndrome wherein actually less was expected of LDOs than of others. An environment such as this would most certainly be counter-productive with all the lack of committment, safety and morale problems the term "loser" conotes. Such a program could not be allowed to continue long regardless of its effect on officer promotion flow or anything else. Few pilots would wish to participate in such a program and few commanding officers would be willing to tolerate its attendant problems.

3. Achievement

Finally, achievement opportunities within the LDO program structure should be provided. This study demonstrates that potential LDOs do not wish to simply remove themselves from the system and stagnate. Like other cosmopolitan professionals, they seek achievement within their profession rather than within the organization. To make the program viable, opportunities for this achievement should be provided.

The failure to provide achievement and success opportunities for LDOs would make the program a dead-end option and much less attractive to skilled pilots. This failure would be particularly tragic as providing these opportunities would be fairly easy to accomplish. Sources of achievement for LDOs could include participation in Aviation Safety Officer and Aviation Maintenance Officer training. Some, if not most, of the prestigious instructor pilot billets at the Coast Guard Aviation Training Center could be designated for LDOs. Date of original qualification as an aircraft commander could be used to determine the pilot in command for flight missions. This would recognize an LDO's expertise and permit him to command a mission even when flying with a slightly more senior officer. The program might even be structured to include two or three senior officer LDOs who would be stationed in key aviation positions. Providing opportunities such as these would contribute to the satisfaction and motivation of the pilots and help prevent any feeling that the program was a dead-end.

APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Notes:

1. Responses in the Background Information section were scored as zeros when items were unmarked.

2. Unmarked items in the Opinion and Interest Survey section were recorded as nines with the exception of the first item. When the first item was left unmarked an eight was recorded.

3. Handwritten numbers indicate the scoring scheme throughout the instrument. With the exception of the first item, all items in the Opinion and Interest Survey section were scored with low values representing cosmopolitan-like responses and high values representing local responses.

4. The handwritten scoring number and notes were not on surveys mailed out for data collection.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please fill in the blanks or check the appropriate response

General

1. Age ________ (2 DIGITS)
2. Rank - Ens. - ☐ 1
   - LTJG. - ☐ 2
   - LT. - ☐ 3
   - LCDR. - ☐ 4
   - CDR. - ☐ 5
   - CAPT. - ☐ 6
3. Years in Grade ________ (1 DIGIT)
4. Total years as Aviator (2 DIGITS) ________
5. Total years in Service (2 DIGITS) ________
6. Obligated Service Complete?
   - Yes - ☐ Ø
   - No - ☐ 1
7. Source of Commission:
   - OCS - ☐ 1
   - OCS (Prior CG Enlisted) - ☐ 2
   - CGA - ☐ 3
   - AVCAD - ☐ 4
   - DCA - Army - ☐ 5
   - DCA - Navy - ☐ 6
   - DCA - AF - ☐ 7
   - DCA - Marines - ☐ 8
   - Other ________ - ☐ 9

Educational Background

8. Yrs. college or equiv. ________ (1 DIGIT)
9. Degree: None - ☐ 1
   - AA - ☐ 2
   - AS - ☐ 3
   - BS - ☐ 4
   - BA-Business - ☐ 5
   - BA-other - ☐ 6
10. Post-graduate study
    - Some - ☐ 1
    - Degree - ☐ 2
11. Type of degree ________

MBA = 1
MS = 2
MA = 3
LAW = 4
OTHER = 7
PHD = 9

12. Went on your own - ☐ 1
    - Sent by CG - ☐ 2
13. Completed Aviation Safety Officer Course - ☐ 1
14. Completed Student Engineer Program - ☐ 1

Background Information (cont.)

Career Experiences

15. Majority of Flight Time in:

H-52 - ☐ 1

H-3 - ☐ 2

C-131/HU-16 - ☐ 3

C-130 - ☐ 4

Tours since Flight School:

16. Number (1 DIGIT)

17. Number DIFOPS Tours (1 DIGIT)

Number of other tours at:

18. Headquarters (1 DIGIT)

19. Dist/Area Staff (1 DIGIT)

20. Grad. School-Staff/War Coll.

(1 DIGIT)

21. Others (Please specify)

(1 DIGIT)

Assignments since Flight School:

22. Air Sta. 23. Other Unit

22 & 23 SCORED AS LOWEST NUMBER CHECKED

22. Air Sta.		23. Other Unit	
1	C.O. - ☐	C.O. - ☐	1
2	X.O. - ☐	X.O. - ☐	2
3	OPS - ☐	OPS - ☐	3
4	E.O. - ☐	E.O. - ☐	4
5	Dept. Hd. - ☐	Dept. Hd. - ☐	5

24. Headquarters Section Head or Above - ☐ 1

25. Mobile Instructor - ☐ 1

26. A.R.S.C. Pilot - ☐ 1

Miscellaneous

27. Married - ☐ Ø

Single - ☐ 1

Civil Pilot Ratings held:

SCORED AS HIGHEST NUMBER CHECKED

28. Private - ☐ 1

Commercial - ☐ 2

ATP - ☐ 3

ATP + Type Rating(s) - ☐ 4

29. Instructor/Ground - ☐ 1

BOTH = 3

Instructor/Flight - ☐ 2

30. Do you keep current in any of your civil ratings through off duty flying?

Yes - ☐ Ø

No - ☐ 1

31. Besides the Coast Guard, how many full time jobs have you held for nine months or more?

0- ☐ Ø 1- ☐ 1 2- ☐ 2 3 or more- ☐ 3

32. Have you had enlisted time in any service?

Yes - ☐ Ø How much? ELIMINATED X

No - ☐ 1

33. Have you had any breaks in military service?

Yes - ☐ Ø

No - ☐ 1

OPINION AND INTEREST SURVEY

1) When you first joined, what attracted you to the Coast Guard as opposed to another service or a civilian job?

Travel Opportunities	Relative in Service	SAR Mission	Didn't want to be Drafted	Other________
☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5

MORE THAN ONE RESPONSE = 9   EDUCATION = 6

2) Did you enter the Coast Guard (or graduate from the Academy or O.C.S.) intending or hoping to become a pilot?

Yes ☐ 1   No ☐ 2

3) All other things being equal, I intend to stay in the Coast Guard at least until 20 year retirement.

Will surely RESIGN before	Probably RESIGN before	Undecided	Probably will STAY IN	Will surely STAY IN
☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5

4) With the exception of out of CONUS tours, I feel that the average tour length should at present be:

Longer	About the Same	Shorter
☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3

——— Please indicate your opinion on the following issues and statements by checking a box on the scale between the two opposite replies. ———

5) I dislike the idea of being assigned to a non-flying staff job during my career.

Strongly Agree ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Strongly Disagree

6) Too much importance is placed on collateral duties in a pilot's fitness report.

Strongly Agree ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Strongly Disagree

7) I would enjoy being the Station Admin. Officer.

Strongly Agree ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 Strongly Disagree

8) I would choose a flying assignment in a less desirable location over a non-flying assignment in a more desirable location.

Strongly Agree ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Strongly Disagree

9) If Coast Guard Aviation was disbanded, I would be ___________ in some other Coast Guard branch, office or field unit.

Very Unhappy ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Just as Happy

10) I would enjoy being the Station X.O.

Strongly Agree ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 Strongly Disagree

11) The kind of pilot who just wants to fly usually doesn't put as much effort into his collateral duties as others do.

Strongly Agree ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 Strongly Disagree

12) My average monthly flight time is:

Lower than I would like ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Higher than I would like

13) Flying is more important to me than getting my staff work done.

Strongly Agree ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Strongly Disagree

14) I dislike paperwork _________ than most other Coast Guard pilots.

Much More ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Much Less

15) I would be willing to forego promotion to CDR in order to continue flying for my entire 20 year career.

Strongly Agree ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Strongly Disagree

16) I feel that, generally, the best tour length for an aviation duty stander at an Air Station is:

6 yrs. or more	5 yrs.	4 yrs.	3 yrs.	2 yrs. or less
☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5

17) It would be worth the effort for the Coast Guard to develop standarized advanced pilot qualifications such as instructor pilot and flight examiner and have someone qualifed at each unit.
Strongly Agree ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Strongly Disagree

18) A Coast Guard pilot's important work is flying the aircraft - administrative duties should be left mostly to others.
Strongly Agree ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Strongly Disagree

19) The primary reason I am in the Coast Guard is because I enjoy flying Coast Guard aircraft.
Strongly Agree ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Strongly Disagree

20) If I could do it without losing rank and benefits, I would transfer to another service to keep flying rather than being promoted out of flying by the Coast Guard.
Strongly Agree ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Strongly Disagree

——— Please indicate how important each of the following things are to you in your career.———

21) Becoming a unit X.O. or C.O.
Very Important ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 Very Unimportant

22) Flying Coast Guard aircraft.
Very Important ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Very Unimportant

23) Participating in decisions concerning the direction of Coast Guard aviation as a whole.
Very Important ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Very Unimportant

24) Becoming an unusually good pilot.
Very Important ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 Very Unimportant

25) Participating in decisions effecting Coast Guard wide policy.
Very Important ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 Very Unimportant

26) Being evaluated only on your abilities as a pilot.

Very Important	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	Very Unimportant

27) Serving in a highly responsible position on a district, area, or headquarters staff.

Very Important	☐ 5	☐ 4	☐ 3	☐ 2	☐ 1	Very Unimportant

28) To what extent do you think of your career as the career of a Coast Guard officer or that of a Coast Guard pilot?

Mostly as a Pilot	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	Mostly as an officer

29) If the Coast Guard wide designations were established, I would be ______________ in becoming a unit instructor pilot, flight examiner, or instrument examiner.

Very Interested	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	Very Uninterested

30) I____________ participate in a program whereby pilots were guaranteed to stay in flying billets their entire career.

Would	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	Would not

31) I ___________ participate in the above mentioned program even if it meant not being promoted beyond Lieutenant Commander.

Would	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	Would not

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Please return it to me at:

Lt. D.A. Goward
SMC 1105
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA. 93940

A pre-addressed return envelope has been enclosed.

Thanks again!

APPENDIX B

SPSS ANALYSIS PROGRAM AND OUTPUT FOR HYPOTHESES 1 THROUGH 7

Note: Data retained on punched cards by Commandant (G-P-1/2) U.S. Coast Guard.

```
SPSS FOR OS/360, VERSION H, RELEASE 8.1, MAY 20, 1980
                              CURRENT DOCUMENTATION FOR THE SPSS BATCH SYSTEM
ORDER FROM MCGRAW-HILL:  SPSS, 2ND ED. (PRINCIPAL TEXT)       ORDER FROM SPSS INC.:  SPSS STATISTICAL ALGORITHMS
                         SPSS PRIMER (BRIEF INTRO TO SPSS)                           SPSS POCKET GUIDE, RELEASE 8
                         SPSS UPDATE (USE W/SPSS,2ND FOR REL. 7 & 8)                 KEYWORDS: THE SPSS INC. NEWSLETTER

DEFAULT SPACE ALLOCATION..     ALLOWS FOR..   384 TRANSFORMATIONS
WORKSPACE    268800 BYTES                    1536 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES
TRANSPACE     38400 BYTES                    6144 IF/COMPUTE OPERATIONS

             1 GET FILE       THESIS


                         FILE THESIS   HAS  99 VARIABLES

                         THE SUBFILES ARE..

                                     NO OF
                         NAME        CASES

                         THESIS       696

             2 COMMENT        HYPOTHESIS ONE - ANALYSIS ****************************************
             3 COMMENT        ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO ITEM SURV31
             4 COMMENT        "I       PARTICIPATE IN THE ABOVE MENTIONED
             5 COMMENT        PROGRAM EVEN IF IT MEANT NOT BEING PROMOTED
             6 COMMENT        BEYOND LIEUTENANT COMMANDER"
CPU TIME REQUIRED..    0.13 SECONDS


             7 FREQUENCIES    GENERAL = SURV31
             8 STATISTICS     ALL
             9 OPTIONS        3,8
            10 COMMENT        ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO ITEM SURV31 BY RANK
GIVEN WORKSPACE ALLOWS FOR  19200 VALUES AND   5760 LABELS PER VARIABLE FOR 'FREQUENCIES'
```

SURV31 ____PARTIC IF LIMITED TO LCDR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
WOULD	1.	130	18.7	18.8	18.8
	2.	75	10.8	10.8	29.6
	3.	80	11.5	11.5	41.1
	4.	82	11.8	11.8	53.0
WOULD NOT	5.	326	46.8	47.0	100.0
	9.	3	0.4	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	696	100.0	100.0	

```
11/12/81         FILE - THESIS    - CREATED 09/30/81

SURV31     ____PARTIC IF LIMITED TO LCDR

     CODE
            I
       1.   ************** (     130)
            I   WOULD
            I
            I
       2.   ********* (     75)
            I
            I
            I
       3.   ********* (     80)
            I
            I
            I
       4.   ********* (     82)
            I
            I
            I
       5.   *********************************** (     326)
            I   WOULD NOT
            I
            I
       9.   * (      3)
 (MISSING)  I
            I
            I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
            0        100       200       300       400       500
            FREQUENCY

MEAN            3.576      STD ERR        0.060      MEDIAN          4.250
MODE            5.000      STD DEV        1.591      VARIANCE        2.531
KURTOSIS       -1.298      SKEWNESS      -0.570      RANGE           4.000
MINIMUM         1.000      MAXIMUM        5.000

VALID CASES       693      MISSING CASES      3
```

```
CPU TIME REQUIRED..     0.34 SECONDS

          11 CROSSTABS     TABLES = BANK BY SURV31
          12 COMMENT       COMPUTIONS AND ANALYSIS FOR THE RELATED
          13 COMMENT       QUESTION OF HOW AN LDO PROGRAM WOULD IMPACT ON
          14 COMMENT       THE OFFICER PROMOTION SYSTEM

 ***** GIVEN WORKSPACE ALLOWS FOR 14933 CELLS, 14933 TABLES WITH     2 DIMENSIONS FOR CROSSTAB PROBLEM *****
```

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * C R O S S T A B U L A T I O N O F * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
RANK RANK BY SURV31 PARTIC IF LIMITED TO LCDR
* PAGE 1 OF 1

RANK	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	SURV31: WOULD 1.	2.	3.	4.	WOULD NOT 5.	ROW TOTAL
ENS	1.	3 50.0 2.3 0.4	2 33.3 2.7 0.3	1 16.7 1.3 0.1	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	6 0.9
LTJG	2.	37 33.3 28.5 5.3	17 15.3 22.7 2.5	9 8.1 11.3 1.3	15 13.5 18.3 2.2	33 29.7 10.1 4.8	111 16.0
LTO3	3.	50 25.4 38.5 7.2	25 12.7 33.3 3.6	34 17.3 42.5 4.9	27 13.7 32.9 3.9	61 31.0 18.7 8.8	197 28.4
LCDR	4.	26 14.2 20.0 3.8	18 9.8 24.0 2.6	23 12.6 28.8 3.3	24 13.1 29.3 3.5	92 50.3 28.2 13.3	183 26.4
CDR	5.	11 8.1 8.5 1.6	9 6.6 12.0 1.3	11 8.1 13.8 1.6	15 11.0 18.3 2.2	90 66.2 27.6 13.0	136 19.6
CAPT	6.	3 5.0 2.3 0.4	4 6.7 5.3 0.6	2 3.3 2.5 0.3	1 1.7 1.2 0.1	50 83.3 15.3 7.2	60 8.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	130 18.8	75 10.8	80 11.5	82 11.8	326 47.0	693 100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

```
CPU TIME REQUIRED..    0.35 SECONDS

          15 *SELECT IF        (RANK LE 4)
          16 *SELECT IF        (SURV31 EQ 1)
          17 *IF               (RANK EQ 1) TCDR = 14
          18 *IF               (RANK EQ 2) TCDR = 13
          19 *IF               (RANK EQ 3) TCDR = 10
          20 *IF               (RANK EQ 4) TCDR =  5
          21 *COMPUTE          COMPETE = 20- YRSERV - (TCDR - YRSINGRD)
          22 FREQUENCIES       GENERAL = COMPETE
          23 STATISTICS        ALL
          24 COMMENT           HYPOTHESIS 2 - ANALYSIS *********************************************
          25 COMMENT           REGRESSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE VARIBLES AGAINST
          26 COMMENT           WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE IN AN LDO PROGRAM
          27 COMMENT           DEFINED AS VALUE OF COMB

GIVEN WORKSPACE ALLOWS FOR  19200 VALUES AND   5760 LABELS PER VARIABLE FOR 'FREQUENCIES'
```

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

COMPETE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	-9.	1	0.9	0.9	0.9
	-8.	2	1.7	1.7	2.6
	-7.	1	0.9	0.9	3.4
	-5.	3	2.6	2.6	6.0
	-4.	3	2.6	2.6	8.6
	-3.	6	5.2	5.2	13.8
	-2.	3	2.6	2.6	16.4
	-1.	11	9.5	9.5	25.9
	0.	10	8.6	8.6	34.5
	1.	8	6.9	6.9	41.4
	2.	13	11.2	11.2	52.6
	3.	4	3.4	3.4	56.0
	4.	7	6.0	6.0	62.1
	5.	16	13.8	13.8	75.9
	6.	24	20.7	20.7	96.6
	7.	4	3.4	3.4	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.000	STD ERR	0.353	MEDIAN	2.269
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	3.802	VARIANCE	14.452
KURTOSIS	-0.100	SKEWNESS	-0.731	RANGE	16.000
MINIMUM	-9.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 116 MISSING CASES 0

```
TRANSPACE REQUIRED..      700 BYTES
      7 TRANSFORMATIONS
      0 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES
     35 IF/COMPUTE OPERATIONS

CPU TIME REQUIRED..    0.23 SECONDS

              28 REGRESSION      VARIABLES=AGE TO OBLSERV,YRSCOLL,FSO,AMO
              29                 NOTOURS,NOFLTBS,ASPOSIT TO CIVILP,CURRENT
              30                 TO SERVBK,SURV02 TO SURV14,SURV16 TO SURV29
              31                 OCS TO MULT, INSTP, COMB/
              32                 REGRESSION=COMB(111,6.63,.80)
              33                 WITH  AGE TO OBLSERV,YRSCOLL,FSO,AMO,NOTOURS,
              34                 NOFLTBS,ASPOSIT TO CIVILP,CURRENT TO SERVBK,
              35                 SURV02 TO SURV14,SURV16 TO SURV29,
              36                 OCS TO MULT,INSTP (1) RESID=0
              37 COMMENT         HYPOTHESIS 3 - ANALYSIS *****************************************
              38 COMMENT         ANALYSIS OF THE GENERAL POPULATION'S
              39 COMMENT         VALUES ON COMB

NO RESIDUALS OUTPUT WAS REQUESTED SO RESIDUALS WILL NOT BE CALCULATED.  SEE MANUAL RE OPTIONS 11,12  AND STATISTICS 4,5,6.

 ***** REGRESSION PROBLEM REQUIRES 112832 BYTES WORKSPACE, NOT INCLUDING RESIDUALS *****
```

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 1.. SURV28 CAREER OF PILOT OR OFFICER

MULTIPLE R	0.56986
R SQUARE	0.32474
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.32370
STANDARD ERROR	2.20633

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	1.	1523.96724	1523.96724	313.06635
RESIDUAL	651.	3168.98529	4.86787	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
SURV28	1.184973	0.56986	0.06697	313.066
(CONSTANT)	2.232121			

-------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION --------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
AGE	0.12395	0.14615	0.93881	14.187
RANK	0.20441	0.23253	0.87383	37.156
YRSINGRD	0.05308	0.06414	0.98608	2.685
YRSAVITR	0.13234	0.15693	0.94952	16.412
YRSERV	0.11739	0.13798	0.93298	12.615
OBLSERV	-0.04048	-0.04890	0.98526	1.558
YRSCOLL	0.14860	0.17885	0.97813	21.478
PSO	-0.00836	-0.01017	0.99988	0.067
AMO	0.00295	0.00357	0.99128	0.008
NOTOURS	0.14802	0.17276	0.91983	19.997
NOPLTRS	0.09644	0.11485	0.95767	8.688
ASPOSIT	0.02359	0.02851	0.98608	0.529
OPOSIT	0.02584	0.03091	0.96622	0.622
HQSEC	0.11120	0.13079	0.93411	11.312
MOBILE	0.03029	0.03685	0.99975	0.884
ARSC	0.07265	0.08755	0.98065	5.021
MARITAL	-0.01893	-0.02287	0.98519	0.340
CIVILP	-0.07453	-0.08932	0.96975	5.227
CURRENT	0.10281	0.12271	0.96200	9.937
JOBS	-0.08322	-0.09853	0.94661	6.372
ENLIST	0.05602	0.06811	0.99825	3.029
SERVBK	0.10849	0.12772	0.93585	10.778
SURV02	0.04179	0.04972	0.95565	1.611
SURV03	0.11925	0.14290	0.96964	13.549
SURV04	0.03712	0.04499	0.99213	1.318
SURV05	0.38191	0.41966	0.81538	138.946
SURV06	0.26921	0.29493	0.81046	61.925
SURV07	0.20790	0.24012	0.90080	39.770
SURV08	0.25225	0.29595	0.92948	62.396
SURV09	0.21872	0.23981	0.81175	39.662
SURV10	0.15587	0.18106	0.91124	22.032
SURV11	0.11861	0.14188	0.96616	13.353
SURV12	0.13057	0.15683	0.97413	16.390
SURV13	0.16892	0.18789	0.83550	23.787
SURV14	0.24561	0.28270	0.89463	56.460
SURV16	0.09345	0.11133	0.95839	8.157
SURV17	0.06855	0.08217	0.97026	4.419
SURV18	0.29957	0.31402	0.74197	71.107
SURV19	0.24951	0.26534	0.76366	49.230
SURV20	0.35941	0.39102	0.79929	117.324
SURV21	0.24908	0.28762	0.90045	58.622
SURV22	0.22272	0.25652	0.89575	45.784
SURV23	-0.06180	-0.07514	0.99832	3.691
SURV24	0.17134	0.20086	0.92803	27.326
SURV25	0.21390	0.24706	0.90092	42.256
SURV26	0.28362	0.30485	0.78018	66.598
SURV27	0.38916	0.42123	0.79113	140.211
SURV29	0.22704	0.26329	0.90810	48.416
OCS	-0.04802	-0.05825	0.99365	2.213
OCSPE	-0.08599	-0.10448	0.99703	7.174
CGA	0.15620	0.18721	0.97006	23.610
AVCAD	-0.02864	-0.03484	0.99941	0.790
DCAAM	-0.00935	-0.01124	0.97568	0.082
DCANY	-0.07347	-0.08934	0.99840	5.230
DCAAF	-0.01310	-0.01592	0.99725	0.165
DCAMAR	-0.01966	-0.02388	0.99584	0.371
AA	0.05137	0.06250	0.99970	2.549

AS	0.00597	0.00726	0.99933	0.034
BS	0.06239	0.07577	0.99583	3.753
BABIZ	-0.01603	-0.01948	0.99706	0.247
BA	-0.04667	-0.05674	0.99809	2.099
MBA	0.02533	0.03070	0.99179	0.613
MS	0.13249	0.15871	0.96892	16.795
MA	0.06882	0.08368	0.99830	4.584
OTH	0.01236	0.01501	0.99658	0.147
PHD	0.08304	0.10056	0.99044	6.641
SOMEPG	-0.01660	-0.02015	0.99572	0.264
PGDRG	0.19065	0.22567	0.94616	34.880
ONOWN	0.01076	0.01308	0.99865	0.111
CGSENT	0.17571	0.20841	0.95006	29.516
HH52	0.02660	0.03232	0.99678	0.680
HH3P	-0.07867	-0.09522	0.98943	5.948
HC130	0.00447	0.00544	0.99999	0.019
TRVL	-0.00170	-0.00207	1.00000	0.003
RELT	0.04684	0.05685	0.99464	2.108
SAR	0.00737	0.00883	0.96860	0.051
DRAFT	-0.01240	-0.01508	0.99841	0.148
EDUC	0.08897	0.10735	0.98308	7.578
MULT	-0.01481	-0.01803	0.99978	0.210
INSTP	-0.06991	-0.08415	0.97845	4.636

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

* M U L T I P L E   R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 2.. SURV05 DISLIKE IDEA OF NON-FLY STAFF JOB

MULTIPLE R	0.66608
R SQUARE	0.44366
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.44195
STANDARD ERROR	2.00418

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	2.	2082.07534	1041.03767	259.17515
RESIDUAL	650.	2610.87719	4.01673	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
SURV28	0.8437489	0.40576	0.06737	156.846
SURV05	0.7053274	0.38191	0.05984	138.946
(CONSTANT)	1.396564			

------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
AGE	0.11883	0.15435	0.93862	15.839
RANK	0.19821	0.24837	0.87357	42.669
YRSINGRD	0.05051	0.06725	0.98603	2.948
YRSAVITR	0.12292	0.16053	0.94883	17.166
YRSERV	0.11594	0.15044	0.93297	14.968
OBLSERV	-0.05510	-0.07326	0.98354	3.502
YRSCOLL	0.12977	0.17180	0.97516	19.739
FSO	-0.01370	-0.01837	0.99964	0.219
AMO	0.04478	0.05935	0.97726	2.294
NOTOURS	0.14067	0.18084	0.91944	21.941
NOFLTRS	0.10128	0.13287	0.95749	11.664
ASPOSIT	0.03545	0.04717	0.98494	1.447
OPOSIT	0.02979	0.03926	0.96610	1.002
HQSEC	0.08559	0.11060	0.92913	8.038
MOBILE	0.03573	0.04789	0.99950	1.492
ARSC	0.08236	0.10931	0.97990	7.848
MARITAL	-0.02888	-0.03842	0.98438	0.959
CIVILP	-0.05044	-0.06644	0.96507	2.877
CURRENT	0.08238	0.10615	0.95866	7.680
JOBS	-0.08760	-0.11426	0.94646	8.585
ENLIST	0.04798	0.06426	0.99771	2.691
SERVBK	0.08905	0.11532	0.93299	8.748
SURV02	0.03550	0.04652	0.95534	1.407
SURV03	0.11750	0.15512	0.96961	16.002
SURV04	0.03528	0.04710	0.99210	1.443
SURV06	0.21261	0.25321	0.78909	44.462
SURV07	0.14723	0.18429	0.87158	22.816
SURV08	0.11424	0.13178	0.74060	11.469
SURV09	0.12218	0.14482	0.74961	13.321
SURV10	0.11894	0.15137	0.90102	15.219
SURV11	0.06790	0.08848	0.94476	5.121
SURV12	0.07440	0.09707	0.94706	6.173
SURV13	0.14934	0.18275	0.83315	22.424
SURV14	0.17831	0.22130	0.85697	33.420
SURV16	0.09376	0.12306	0.95839	9.980
SURV17	0.09865	0.12981	0.96341	11.124
SURV18	0.24044	0.27393	0.72207	52.648
SURV19	0.19263	0.22292	0.74507	33.938
SURV20	0.27382	0.31547	0.73844	71.728
SURV21	0.23234	0.29521	0.89841	61.960
SURV22	0.15263	0.18931	0.85586	24.125
SURV23	-0.03530	-0.04714	0.99234	1.445
SURV24	0.13035	0.16714	0.91473	18.651
SURV25	0.15133	0.18919	0.86950	24.091
SURV26	0.22827	0.26700	0.76119	49.819
SURV27	0.28155	0.30980	0.67359	68.903
SURV29	0.19757	0.25149	0.90147	43.818
OCS	-0.06795	-0.09066	0.99043	5.378
OCSPE	-0.06737	-0.09005	0.99407	5.306
CGA	0.16164	0.21341	0.96982	30.968
AVCAD	-0.00740	-0.00991	0.99562	0.064
DCAAM	-0.02402	-0.03179	0.97396	0.656
DCANY	-0.05989	-0.08016	0.99683	4.197
DCAAF	-0.03443	-0.04601	0.99349	1.377
DCAMAR	-0.00939	-0.01255	0.99496	0.102
AA	0.04992	0.06691	0.99968	2.919
AS	0.01529	0.02048	0.99860	0.272

BS	0.08657	0.11555	0.99112	8.783
BABIZ	-0.02236	-0.02993	0.99672	0.582
BA	-0.07238	-0.09668	0.99272	6.124
MBA	0.00299	0.00399	0.98766	0.010
MS	0.11283	0.14866	0.96575	14.666
MA	0.07495	0.10038	0.99799	6.606
OTH	-0.00208	-0.00279	0.99484	0.005
PHD	0.06274	0.08356	0.98697	4.563
SOMEPG	-0.00664	-0.00887	0.99489	0.051
PGDRG	0.16015	0.20801	0.93856	29.351
ONOWN	0.00152	0.00204	0.99793	0.003
CGSENT	0.16493	0.21543	0.94915	31.585
HH52	0.00763	0.01019	0.99377	0.067
HH3P	-0.05280	-0.07021	0.98379	3.215
HC130	-0.00774	-0.01037	0.99873	0.070
TRVL	-0.01108	-0.01485	0.99926	0.143
RELT	0.03715	0.04966	0.99386	1.604
SAR	0.01273	0.01680	0.96837	0.183
DRAFT	-0.01597	-0.02139	0.99831	0.297
EDUC	0.08460	0.11245	0.98293	8.312
MULT	-0.01188	-0.01593	0.99971	0.165
INSTP	-0.05082	-0.06729	0.97546	2.952

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 3.. SURV21 IMPORT OF BEING XO OR CO

MULTIPLE R	0.70153
R SQUARE	0.49215
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.48980
STANDARD ERROR	1.91633

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	3.	2309.61405	769.87135	209.64144
RESIDUAL	649.	2383.33848	3.67232	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
SURV28	0.7017079	0.33745	0.06690	110.023
SURV05	0.6838740	0.37029	0.05728	142.549
SURV21	0.4280179	0.23231	0.05438	61.960
(CONSTANT)	0.4362002			

-------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION --------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
AGE	0.09534	0.12886	0.92764	10.941
RANK	0.16167	0.20871	0.84637	29.511
YRSINGRD	0.06365	0.08854	0.98268	5.120
YRSAVITR	0.09776	0.13271	0.93579	11.617
YRSERV	0.09777	0.13207	0.92660	11.503
OBLSERV	-0.05347	-0.07440	0.98348	3.607
YRSCOLL	0.09302	0.12684	0.94425	10.596
PSO	-0.01907	-0.02675	0.99905	0.464
AMO	0.05563	0.07708	0.97499	3.873
NOTOURS	0.11336	0.15129	0.90464	15.180
NOFLTRS	0.08373	0.11459	0.95130	8.623
ASPOSIT	0.03938	0.05484	0.98463	1.955
OPOSIT	0.00781	0.01073	0.95673	0.075
HQSEC	0.06161	0.08285	0.91827	4.479
MOBILE	0.02454	0.03438	0.99689	0.767
ARSC	0.07585	0.10531	0.97904	7.267
MARITAL	-0.01880	-0.02615	0.98234	0.443
CIVILP	-0.04170	-0.05744	0.96358	2.145
CURRENT	0.08043	0.11050	0.95859	8.009
JOBS	-0.07795	-0.10632	0.94469	7.409
ENLIST	0.02450	0.03414	0.98611	0.756
SERVBK	0.06757	0.09115	0.92421	5.429
SURV02	0.03877	0.05318	0.95514	1.838
SURV03	0.08740	0.11953	0.94990	9.392
SURV04	0.02057	0.02869	0.98766	0.534
SURV06	0.17060	0.20854	0.75881	29.461
SURV07	0.09681	0.12321	0.82269	9.989
SURV08	0.16088	0.19161	0.72038	24.697
SURV09	0.13388	0.16248	0.74810	17.572
SURV10	0.00343	0.00395	0.67425	0.010
SURV11	0.05941	0.08097	0.94340	4.277
SURV12	0.10397	0.14089	0.93258	13.123
SURV13	0.12609	0.16066	0.82452	17.170
SURV14	0.14569	0.18708	0.83740	23.503
SURV16	0.06347	0.08632	0.93954	4.865
SURV17	0.09490	0.13069	0.96314	11.261
SURV18	0.19857	0.23250	0.69628	37.031
SURV19	0.19438	0.23543	0.74504	38.026
SURV20	0.25281	0.30361	0.73246	65.796
SURV22	0.22329	0.28126	0.80576	55.665
SURV23	0.04189	0.05531	0.88510	1.988
SURV24	0.18097	0.23639	0.88130	39.045
SURV25	0.07901	0.09698	0.76516	6.152
SURV26	0.20738	0.25288	0.75512	44.269
SURV27	0.20495	0.21412	0.55434	31.137
SURV29	0.21057	0.28014	0.89889	55.184
OCS	-0.05946	-0.08297	0.98894	4.492
OCSPE	-0.04060	-0.05637	0.97878	2.065
CGA	0.12986	0.17725	0.94613	21.019
AVCAD	0.00353	0.00493	0.99318	0.016
DCAAM	-0.02818	-0.03902	0.97363	0.988
DCANY	-0.04540	-0.06347	0.99242	2.621
DCAAF	-0.02516	-0.03516	0.99172	0.802
DCAMAR	-0.01116	-0.01562	0.99490	0.158
AA	0.05133	0.07202	0.99964	3.378
AS	0.03311	0.04628	0.99222	1.391
BS	0.06174	0.08566	0.97777	4.790

BABIZ	-0.02482	-0.03477	0.99660	0.785
BA	-0.06454	-0.09018	0.99144	5.313
MBA	0.00259	0.00361	0.98766	0.008
MS	0.08753	0.11986	0.95222	9.445
MA	0.05624	0.07854	0.99047	4.022
OTH	0.01149	0.01606	0.99110	0.167
PHD	0.06289	0.08768	0.98697	5.020
SOMEPG	-0.02402	-0.03351	0.98883	0.729
PGDRG	0.13218	0.17809	0.92185	21.225
ONOWN	-0.01737	-0.02426	0.99070	0.382
CGSENT	0.14132	0.19197	0.93747	24.795
HH52	-0.00141	-0.00198	0.99210	0.003
HH3P	-0.03755	-0.05214	0.97904	1.766
HC130	0.00050	0.00070	0.99734	0.000
TRVL	-0.00347	-0.00486	0.99807	0.015
RELT	0.03952	0.05528	0.99374	1.986
SAR	0.01797	0.02481	0.96784	0.399
DRAFT	-0.00410	-0.00573	0.99540	0.021
EDUC	0.06674	0.09253	0.97624	5.596
MULT	-0.01131	-0.01587	0.99970	0.163
INSTP	-0.04673	-0.06475	0.97513	2.729

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 4.. SURV22 IMPORT OF FLYING CG ACFT

MULTIPLE R	0.72960
R SQUARE	0.53232
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.52943
STANDARD ERROR	1.84039

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	4.	2498.15446	624.53862	184.39101
RESIDUAL	648.	2194.79806	3.38703	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
SURV28	0.5636666	0.27107	0.06686	71.078
SURV05	0.5878008	0.31827	0.05650	108.249
SURV21	0.5251724	0.28504	0.05382	95.218
SURV22	0.6177930	0.22329	0.08280	55.665
(CONSTANT)	-0.3300551			

------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
AGE	0.08451	0.11885	0.92499	9.270
RANK	0.15774	0.21216	0.84608	30.496
YRSINGRD	0.05169	0.07479	0.97913	3.639
YRSAVITR	0.08748	0.12358	0.93339	10.034
YRSERV	0.08385	0.11774	0.92222	9.096
OBLSERV	-0.04558	-0.06604	0.98196	2.834
YRSCOLL	0.08484	0.12045	0.94272	9.526
FSO	-0.01640	-0.02397	0.99887	0.372
AMO	0.05622	0.08118	0.97499	4.292
NOTOURS	0.10861	0.15101	0.90417	15.099
NOPLTRS	0.08476	0.12088	0.95128	9.594
ASPOSIT	0.02632	0.03811	0.98044	0.941
OPOSIT	-0.00075	-0.00107	0.95506	0.001
HQSEC	0.05732	0.08030	0.91788	4.199
MOBILE	0.03087	0.04504	0.99591	1.315
ARSC	0.07107	0.10279	0.97849	6.909
MARITAL	-0.01030	-0.01491	0.98059	0.144
CIVILP	-0.02837	-0.04063	0.95940	1.070
CURRENT	0.05798	0.08248	0.94629	4.432
JOBS	-0.06520	-0.09248	0.94093	5.582
ENLIST	0.04446	0.06425	0.97687	2.682
SERVBK	0.07071	0.09939	0.92400	6.456
SURV02	0.01873	0.02663	0.94585	0.459
SURV03	0.09654	0.13745	0.94810	12.459
SURV04	0.02258	0.03282	0.98756	0.698
SURV06	0.15078	0.19126	0.75244	24.565
SURV07	0.08212	0.10867	0.81887	7.732
SURV08	0.09329	0.10933	0.64242	7.828
SURV09	0.07834	0.09559	0.69633	5.966
SURV10	-0.01546	-0.01851	0.67025	0.222
SURV11	0.04436	0.06283	0.93823	2.564
SURV12	0.05293	0.07210	0.86776	3.381
SURV13	0.11763	0.15607	0.82326	16.353
SURV14	0.14000	0.18728	0.83682	23.517
SURV16	0.06967	0.09871	0.93871	6.366
SURV17	0.06918	0.09840	0.94640	6.326
SURV18	0.16259	0.19553	0.67636	25.719
SURV19	0.11576	0.13182	0.60646	11.442
SURV20	0.23625	0.29479	0.72816	61.577
SURV23	-0.00560	-0.00751	0.84163	0.036
SURV24	0.11803	0.15048	0.76017	14.991
SURV25	0.08528	0.10904	0.76460	7.786
SURV26	0.18932	0.23971	0.74978	39.443
SURV27	0.17148	0.18495	0.54406	22.915
SURV29	0.16799	0.22539	0.84194	34.627
OCS	-0.05309	-0.07717	0.98794	3.876
OCSPE	-0.05446	-0.07861	0.97436	4.023
CGA	0.13164	0.18723	0.94606	23.505
AVCAD	0.01616	0.02350	0.98930	0.358
DCAAM	-0.03902	-0.05622	0.97091	2.051
DCANY	-0.04001	-0.05826	0.99169	2.204
DCAAF	-0.01490	-0.02167	0.98943	0.304
DCAMAR	-0.01763	-0.02569	0.99387	0.427
AA	0.04571	0.06681	0.99885	2.901
AS	0.03285	0.04785	0.99222	1.485
DS	0.07278	0.10509	0.97497	7.225
BADIZ	-0.03269	-0.04769	0.99509	1.475

BA	-0.06628	-0.09650	0.99137	6.082
MBA	0.00831	0.01206	0.98687	0.094
MS	0.09587	0.13669	0.95071	12.319
MA	0.02984	0.04304	0.97276	1.201
OTH	0.00076	0.00110	0.98828	0.001
PHD	0.05429	0.07880	0.98513	4.042
SOMEPG	-0.02213	-0.03217	0.98874	0.670
PGDRG	0.11610	0.16247	0.91586	17.541
ONOWN	-0.02277	-0.03313	0.98999	0.711
CGSENT	0.12675	0.17893	0.93208	21.400
HH52	-0.01856	-0.02693	0.98502	0.470
HH3F	-0.02975	-0.04302	0.97757	1.199
HC130	0.01335	0.01946	0.99328	0.245
TRVL	-0.01701	-0.02480	0.99357	0.398
RELT	0.02680	0.03898	0.98969	0.985
SAR	0.02589	0.03722	0.96639	0.898
DRAFT	-0.01028	-0.01500	0.99446	0.146
EDUC	0.06586	0.09516	0.97622	5.912
MULT	-0.00155	-0.00226	0.99733	0.003
INSTP	-0.04422	-0.06385	0.97498	2.648

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 5.. SURV29 ____IN BECOMING UNIT INSTR PILOT

MULTIPLE R	0.74571
R SQUARE	0.55608
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.55265
STANDARD ERROR	1.79442

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	5.	2609.65106	521.93021	162.09313
RESIDUAL	647.	2083.30146	3.21994	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
SURV28	0.4934206	0.23729	0.06627	55.433
SURV05	0.5782168	0.31308	0.05511	110.087
SURV21	0.5223101	0.28349	0.05248	99.061
SURV22	0.4941960	0.17862	0.08342	35.094
SURV29	0.3416781	0.16799	0.05806	34.627
(CONSTANT)	-0.5777731			

------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
AGE	0.06121	0.08730	0.90291	4.961
RANK	0.13154	0.17855	0.81791	21.273
YRSINGRD	0.04508	0.06689	0.97732	2.903
YRSAVITR	0.06665	0.09572	0.91547	5.973
YRSERV	0.06035	0.08592	0.89991	4.804
OBLSERV	-0.02349	-0.03457	0.96127	0.773
YRSCOLL	0.08175	0.11910	0.94235	9.296
FSO	0.00125	0.00186	0.98581	0.002
AMO	0.03369	0.04937	0.95330	1.578
NOTOURS	0.08138	0.11413	0.87316	8.526
NOFLTRS	0.06147	0.08887	0.92786	5.143
ASPOSIT	0.01740	0.02581	0.97718	0.431
OPOSIT	-0.00905	-0.01326	0.95243	0.114
HQSEC	0.04095	0.05856	0.90785	2.223
MOBILE	0.03904	0.05839	0.99320	2.210
ARSC	0.05040	0.07409	0.95961	3.566
MARITAL	-0.01419	-0.02108	0.97998	0.287
CIVILP	-0.02099	-0.03082	0.95726	0.614
CURRENT	0.03705	0.05358	0.92866	1.860
JOBS	-0.05111	-0.07410	0.93308	3.567
ENLIST	0.04839	0.07175	0.97626	3.343
SERVBK	0.06447	0.09295	0.92256	5.629
SURV02	0.02178	0.03178	0.94550	0.653
SURV03	0.08296	0.12075	0.94042	9.559
SURV04	0.02317	0.03456	0.98755	0.772
SURV06	0.12957	0.16721	0.73931	18.582
SURV07	0.09454	0.12809	0.81484	10.776
SURV08	0.07612	0.09118	0.63691	5.416
SURV09	0.07495	0.09385	0.69609	5.740
SURV10	0.00511	0.00624	0.66230	0.025
SURV11	0.03796	0.05514	0.93668	1.970
SURV12	0.03735	0.05198	0.85972	1.750
SURV13	0.10252	0.13899	0.81593	12.726
SURV14	0.13382	0.18361	0.83562	22.537
SURV16	0.06670	0.09697	0.93837	6.133
SURV17	0.02638	0.03694	0.87036	0.883
SURV18	0.14847	0.18267	0.67198	22.300
SURV19	0.11555	0.13506	0.60646	12.003
SURV20	0.21777	0.27691	0.71775	53.647
SURV23	-0.01798	-0.02469	0.83713	0.394
SURV24	0.08105	0.10311	0.71841	6.942
SURV25	0.08103	0.10631	0.76414	7.384
SURV26	0.16456	0.21097	0.72963	30.093
SURV27	0.17660	0.19545	0.54375	25.657
OCS	-0.03992	-0.05933	0.98048	2.282
OCSPE	-0.05678	-0.08411	0.97415	4.603
CGA	0.12314	0.17948	0.94308	21.501
AVCAD	0.00803	0.01198	0.98656	0.093
DCAAM	-0.03850	-0.05694	0.97090	2.102
DCANY	-0.03824	-0.05715	0.99156	2.117
DCAAF	-0.00769	-0.01147	0.98698	0.085
DCAMAR	-0.01632	-0.02442	0.99380	0.385
AA	0.03199	0.04778	0.99063	1.478
AS	0.01494	0.02218	0.97862	0.318
BS	0.06838	0.10130	0.97418	6.698
BABIZ	-0.02595	-0.03881	0.99316	0.974
BA	-0.05336	-0.07944	0.98403	4.102

MBA	0.01145	0.01707	0.98646	0.188
MS	0.07742	0.11242	0.93603	8.269
MA	0.03414	0.05052	0.97203	1.653
OTH	0.01274	0.01855	0.98245	0.232
PHD	0.04627	0.06884	0.98242	3.076
SOMEPG	-0.01379	-0.02055	0.98585	0.273
PGDEG	0.10054	0.14363	0.90609	13.608
ONOWN	-0.01132	-0.01685	0.98452	0.184
CGSENT	0.10893	0.15666	0.91827	16.254
HH52	-0.02473	-0.03681	0.98348	0.876
HH3F	-0.03823	-0.05665	0.97475	2.080
HC130	0.01483	0.02218	0.99319	0.318
TRVL	-0.01154	-0.01725	0.99232	0.192
BELT	0.02453	0.03663	0.98948	0.868
SAR	0.02529	0.03731	0.96638	0.901
DRAFT	-0.00988	-0.01479	0.99445	0.141
EDUC	0.06571	0.09745	0.97622	6.193
MULT	-0.00289	-0.00434	0.99726	0.012
INSTP	-0.02142	-0.03138	0.95330	0.637

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 6.. SURV14 DISLIKE PAPERWK___THAN OTHERS

MULTIPLE R	0.75567
R SQUARE	0.57104
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.56706
STANDARD ERROR	1.76528

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	6.	2679.88160	446.64693	143.33023
RESIDUAL	646.	2013.07092	3.11621	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
SURV28	0.4452001	0.21410	0.06598	45.525
SURV05	0.5287601	0.28630	0.05521	91.738
SURV21	0.4844437	0.26294	0.05224	86.002
SURV22	0.4879358	0.17636	0.08208	35.340
SURV29	0.3314168	0.16294	0.05716	33.615
SURV14	0.3887411	0.13382	0.08189	22.537
(CONSTANT)	-1.411393			

------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
AGE	0.05552	0.08046	0.90107	4.203
RANK	0.12606	0.17391	0.81646	20.117
YRSINGRD	0.04195	0.06330	0.97669	2.595
YRSAVITR	0.06109	0.08915	0.91366	5.168
YRSERV	0.05324	0.07700	0.89705	3.847
OBLSERV	-0.02442	-0.03656	0.96122	0.863
YRSCOLL	0.07493	0.11089	0.93940	8.030
FSO	0.00310	0.00470	0.98559	0.014
AMO	0.03871	0.05766	0.95180	2.152
NOTOURS	0.08166	0.11651	0.87316	8.877
NOFLTBS	0.06168	0.09071	0.92786	5.352
ASPOSIT	0.01901	0.02869	0.97701	0.532
OPOSIT	-0.00496	-0.00739	0.95142	0.035
HOSEC	0.04152	0.06040	0.90783	2.362
MOBILE	0.04597	0.06984	0.99015	3.162
ABSC	0.04789	0.07162	0.95922	3.325
MARITAL	-0.00643	-0.00970	0.97610	0.061
CIVILP	-0.01901	-0.02839	0.95702	0.520
CURRENT	0.03817	0.05616	0.92859	2.041
JOBS	-0.04541	-0.06690	0.93412	2.900
ENLIST	0.04882	0.07366	0.97624	3.518
SERVBK	0.05926	0.08683	0.92095	4.900
SURV02	0.02254	0.03347	0.94547	0.723
SURV03	0.07043	0.10371	0.92994	7.012
SURV04	0.02001	0.03035	0.98689	0.595
SURV06	0.11543	0.15064	0.73052	14.976
SURV07	0.06665	0.08935	0.77085	5.191
SURV08	0.08022	0.09772	0.63646	6.219
SURV09	0.06976	0.08680	0.69519	5.127
SURV10	-0.00197	-0.00244	0.66083	0.004
SURV11	0.01937	0.02829	0.91545	0.517
SURV12	0.04049	0.05730	0.85924	2.125
SURV13	0.07490	0.10042	0.77112	6.571
SURV16	0.06724	0.09945	0.93836	6.442
SURV17	0.02848	0.04057	0.87014	1.063
SURV18	0.12349	0.15141	0.64489	15.134
SURV19	0.10250	0.12140	0.60175	9.648
SURV20	0.20669	0.26633	0.71223	49.245
SURV23	-0.01785	-0.02493	0.83713	0.401
SURV24	0.06719	0.08650	0.71111	4.863
SURV25	0.07151	0.09521	0.76034	5.901
SURV26	0.14403	0.18500	0.70763	22.856
SURV27	0.16651	0.18707	0.54145	23.391
OCS	-0.03307	-0.04992	0.97737	1.611
OCSPE	-0.05842	-0.08803	0.97398	5.037
CGA	0.11654	0.17254	0.94021	19.791
AVCAD	0.01388	0.02103	0.98436	0.285
DCAAM	-0.04533	-0.06809	0.96808	3.005
DCANY	-0.03023	-0.04586	0.98721	1.360
DCAAF	-0.01314	-0.01991	0.98506	0.256
DCAMAR	-0.01348	-0.02051	0.99327	0.271
AA	0.02820	0.04284	0.98967	1.186
AS	0.01493	0.02254	0.97862	0.328
BS	0.06349	0.09561	0.97260	5.950
BABIZ	-0.02352	-0.03579	0.99277	0.827
BA	-0.05159	-0.07813	0.98383	3.962
MBA	0.00842	0.01277	0.98587	0.105

MS	0.06927	0.10209	0.93183	6.793
MA	0.03240	0.04877	0.97184	1.538
OTH	0.00516	0.00780	0.97873	0.039
PHD	0.04155	0.06284	0.98095	2.557
SOMEPG	-0.01646	-0.02495	0.98539	0.402
PGDRG	0.09216	0.13362	0.90182	11.726
ONOWN	-0.01300	-0.01969	0.98434	0.250
CGSENT	0.10015	0.14615	0.94339	14.077
HH52	-0.01539	-0.02323	0.97774	0.348
HH3P	-0.03981	-0.06000	0.97460	2.330
HC130	0.01088	0.01654	0.99216	0.177
TRVL	-0.01356	-0.02063	0.99205	0.275
RELT	0.02549	0.03871	0.98942	0.968
SAR	0.03126	0.04686	0.96421	1.419
DRAFT	-0.00639	-0.00973	0.99365	0.061
EDUC	0.05731	0.08624	0.97141	4.833
MULT	-0.00594	-0.00906	0.99664	0.053
INSTP	-0.01935	-0.02883	0.95304	0.537

SPSS BATCH SYSTEM 11/12/81 PAGE 21

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 7.. RANK RANK

MULTIPLE R	0.76421
R SQUARE	0.58402
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.57950
STANDARD ERROR	1.73972

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	7.	2740.76836	391.53834	129.36394
RESIDUAL	645.	1952.18417	3.02664	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
SURV28	C.3804799	0.18297	0.06661	32.628
SURV05	0.5309717	0.28750	0.05441	95.236
SURV21	0.4448792	0.24146	0.05223	72.545
SURV22	C.4986136	0.18022	0.08093	37.963
SURV29	0.2849207	0.14008	0.05728	24.742
SURV14	0.3734543	0.12856	0.08077	21.377
RANK	0.2833004	0.12606	0.06316	20.117
(CONSTANT)	-2.002819			

------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
AGE	-0.14726	-0.11934	0.27319	9.304
YRSINGRD	0.01586	0.02363	0.92325	0.360
YRSAVITR	-0.10300	-0.08953	0.31428	5.203
YRSERV	-0.12691	-0.10970	0.31083	7.845
OBLSERV	0.05157	0.06650	0.69160	2.860
YRSCOLL	0.06507	0.09741	0.93209	6.169
PSO	-0.00780	-0.01196	0.97679	0.092
AMO	0.02806	0.04225	0.94351	1.152
NOTOURS	-0.05426	-0.04527	0.28953	1.323
NOPLTRS	-0.05094	-0.05235	0.43937	1.770
ASPOSIT	-0.01541	-0.02261	0.89618	0.330
OPOSIT	-0.04098	-0.05948	0.87642	2.287
HQSEC	-0.00626	-0.00851	0.76860	0.047
MOBILE	0.02162	0.03252	0.94133	0.602
ARSC	0.03148	0.04728	0.93850	1.443
MARITAL	0.01061	0.01608	0.95532	0.167
CIVILP	-0.01480	-0.02244	0.95576	0.324
CURRENT	0.02901	0.04320	0.92278	1.204
JOBS	-0.01498	-0.02161	0.86485	0.301
ENLIST	0.05172	0.07921	0.97564	4.066
SERVBK	0.04008	0.05875	0.89384	2.230
SURV02	0.00389	0.00578	0.92123	0.022
SURV03	0.02956	0.04084	0.79377	1.076
SURV04	0.01660	0.02555	0.98601	0.421
SURV06	0.08591	0.10969	0.67817	7.843
SURV07	0.04927	0.06640	0.75539	2.852
SURV08	0.09197	0.11342	0.63255	8.392
SURV09	0.05601	0.07201	0.68751	3.357
SURV10	0.00951	0.01195	0.65645	0.092
SURV11	0.00890	0.01315	0.90827	0.111
SURV12	0.04432	0.06366	0.85843	2.621
SURV13	0.07024	0.09557	0.77008	5.936
SURV16	0.06179	0.09270	0.93624	5.582
SURV17	0.01999	0.02883	0.86582	0.536
SURV18	0.09080	0.10851	0.59399	7.673
SURV19	0.09500	0.11411	0.60007	8.495
SURV20	0.19457	0.25315	0.70422	44.097
SURV23	-0.01981	-0.02810	0.83693	0.509
SURV24	0.05599	0.07294	0.70586	3.444
SURV25	0.06524	0.08810	0.75850	5.038
SURV26	0.13210	0.17148	0.70092	19.511
SURV27	0.16108	0.18365	0.54073	22.480
OCS	-0.01873	-0.02848	0.96159	0.523
OCSPE	-0.06804	-0.10378	0.96781	7.012
CGA	0.09927	0.14701	0.91236	14.226
AVCAD	0.00812	0.01248	0.98187	0.100
DCAAM	-0.02632	-0.03956	0.93983	1.009
DCANY	-0.02550	-0.03925	0.98550	0.994
DCAAF	-0.00421	-0.00646	0.97906	0.027
DCAMAR	-0.01401	-0.02165	0.99324	0.302
AA	0.02885	0.04450	0.98964	1.278
AS	0.01628	0.02497	0.97848	0.402
BS	0.05982	0.09142	0.97158	5.428
BABIZ	-0.02349	-0.03629	0.99277	0.849
BA	-0.03627	-0.05523	0.96466	1.970
MBA	0.00838	0.01290	0.98587	0.107
MS	0.05099	0.07524	0.90586	3.667

MA	0.02134	0.03246	0.96260	0.679
OTH	-0.00011	-0.00017	0.97668	0.000
PHD	0.03779	0.05800	0.97988	2.174
SOMEPG	-0.01196	-0.01840	0.98387	0.218
PGDRG	0.06700	0.09571	0.84876	5.954
ONOWN	-0.00931	-0.01431	0.98332	0.132
CGSENT	0.07340	0.10475	0.84725	7.145
HH52	0.00380	0.00574	0.95090	0.021
HH3P	-0.03326	-0.05082	0.97135	1.667
HC130	0.00907	0.01400	0.99491	0.126
TRVL	-0.02055	-0.03168	0.98842	0.647
RELT	0.01594	0.02449	0.98237	0.387
SAR	0.05136	0.07716	0.93900	3.857
DRAFT	-0.01639	-0.02524	0.98622	0.410
EDUC	0.04159	0.06290	0.95144	2.558
MULT	0.00135	0.00208	0.99258	0.003
INSTP	-0.01129	-0.01705	0.94844	0.187

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 8.. CGA

MULTIPLE R	0.77007
R SQUARE	0.59301
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.58795
STANDARD ERROR	1.72216

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	8.	2782.95882	347.86985	117.29263
RESIDUAL	644.	1909.99371	2.96583	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
SURV28	0.3665317	0.17627	0.06604	30.804
SURV05	0.5373109	0.29093	0.05389	99.427
SURV21	0.4230816	0.22963	0.05203	66.129
SURV22	0.5042342	0.18225	0.08012	39.606
SURV29	0.2801184	0.13772	0.05672	24.393
SURV14	0.3587809	0.12351	0.08005	20.087
RANK	0.2420985	0.10773	0.06347	14.548
CGA	0.5379496	0.09927	0.14263	14.226
(CONSTANT)	-1.932053			

------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
AGE	-0.07608	-0.05415	0.20618	1.891
YRSINGRD	0.00848	0.01274	0.91802	0.104
YRSAVITR	-0.04346	-0.03514	0.26614	0.795
YRSERV	-0.06580	-0.05188	0.25302	1.736
OBLSERV	0.00104	0.00122	0.55466	0.001
YRSCOLL	0.03427	0.04842	0.81232	1.511
FSO	0.00550	0.00845	0.95829	0.046
AMO	0.01735	0.02625	0.93169	0.443
NOTOURS	-0.02070	-0.01713	0.27853	0.189
NOFLTRS	-0.01079	-0.01074	0.40321	0.074
ASPOSIT	-0.01031	-0.01527	0.89383	0.150
OPOSIT	-0.03903	-0.05726	0.87609	2.115
HQSEC	-0.02490	-0.03374	0.74742	0.733
MOBILE	0.02733	0.04150	0.93822	1.109
ARSC	0.01932	0.02910	0.92325	0.545
MARITAL	0.00394	0.00602	0.95078	0.023
CIVILP	-0.00577	-0.00881	0.94738	0.050
CURRENT	0.03105	0.04674	0.92240	1.408
JOBS	0.03147	0.04194	0.72301	1.133
ENLIST	-0.00026	-0.00033	0.69042	0.000
SERVBK	0.00467	0.00646	0.77862	0.027
SURV02	-0.00087	-0.00131	0.91909	0.001
SURV03	0.05624	0.07655	0.75389	3.790
SURV04	0.01653	0.02573	0.98601	0.426
SURV06	0.07860	0.10123	0.67517	6.658
SURV07	0.05708	0.07758	0.75178	3.894
SURV08	0.09264	0.11550	0.63254	8.693
SURV09	0.04771	0.06183	0.68364	2.468
SURV10	0.01508	0.01912	0.65498	0.235
SURV11	0.01484	0.02212	0.90509	0.315
SURV12	0.05158	0.07473	0.85439	3.611
SURV13	0.07503	0.10311	0.76866	6.910
SURV16	0.05513	0.08341	0.93155	4.505
SURV17	0.01432	0.02085	0.86310	0.280
SURV18	0.08329	0.10042	0.59157	6.550
SURV19	0.08129	0.09797	0.59115	6.231
SURV20	0.18601	0.24371	0.69867	40.602
SURV23	-0.02609	-0.03735	0.83395	0.898
SURV24	0.05432	0.07153	0.70571	3.307
SURV25	0.06434	0.08783	0.75845	4.999
SURV26	0.12494	0.16358	0.69764	17.679
SURV27	0.15899	0.18323	0.54058	22.337
OCS	0.02264	0.03201	0.81389	0.660
OCSPE	-0.03670	-0.05235	0.82793	1.767
AVCAD	0.02900	0.04409	0.94045	1.252
DCAAM	-0.00337	-0.00498	0.88724	0.016
DCANY	-0.01467	-0.02267	0.97236	0.331
DCAAP	0.00813	0.01250	0.96319	0.100
DCAMAR	0.00068	0.00104	0.96963	0.001
AA	0.03905	0.06057	0.97921	2.367
AS	0.02599	0.04010	0.96896	1.036
BS	0.00225	0.00276	0.61343	0.005
BABIZ	-0.00244	-0.00371	0.94361	0.009
BA	-0.00869	-0.01279	0.88160	0.105
MBA	0.00424	0.00660	0.98401	0.028
MS	0.02673	0.03848	0.84371	0.954
MA	0.02214	0.03405	0.96254	0.746

OTH	0.00397	0.00615	0.97492	0.024
PHD	0.02849	0.04399	0.97007	1.247
SOMEPG	-0.00839	-0.01304	0.98248	0.109
PGDRG	0.04365	0.06096	0.79385	2.399
ONOWN	-0.00374	-0.00580	0.97996	0.022
CGSENT	0.04803	0.06645	0.77899	2.852
HH52	-0.00105	-0.00161	0.94854	0.002
HH3F	-0.03245	-0.05014	0.97128	4.620
HC130	0.01431	0.02231	0.98894	0.320
TRVL	-0.01905	-0.02568	0.98818	0.567
RELT	0.01538	0.02390	0.98234	0.368
SAR	0.04775	0.07247	0.93767	3.395
DRAFT	0.00927	0.01393	0.91846	0.125
EDUC	-0.00103	-0.00142	0.77020	0.001
MULT	0.00424	0.00662	0.99166	0.028
INSTP	-0.00371	-0.00564	0.94265	0.020

F-LEVEL OR TOLERANCE-LEVEL INSUFFICIENT FOR FURTHER COMPUTATION

STATISTICS WHICH CANNOT BE COMPUTED ARE PRINTED AS ALL NINES.

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

SUMMARY TABLE

VARIABLE		MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	RSQ CHANGE	SIMPLE R	B	BETA
SURV28	CAREER OF PILOT OR OFFICER	0.56986	0.32474	0.32474	0.56986	0.3665317	0.17627
SURV05	DISLIKE IDEA OF NON-FLY STAFF JOB	0.66608	0.44366	0.11892	0.55625	0.5373109	0.29093
SURV21	IMPORT OF BEING XO OR CO	0.70153	0.49215	0.04849	0.40408	0.4230816	0.22963
SURV22	IMPORT OF FLYING CG ACFT	0.72960	0.53232	0.04018	0.38350	0.5042342	0.18225
SURV29	IN BECOMING UNIT INSTR PILOT	0.74571	0.55608	0.02376	0.37893	0.2801184	0.13772
SURV14	DISLIKE PAPERWK___THAN OTHERS	0.75567	0.57104	0.01497	0.40471	0.3587809	0.12351
RANK	RANK	0.76421	0.58402	0.01297	0.38104	0.2420985	0.10773
CGA		0.77007	0.59301	0.00899	0.25013	0.5379496	0.09927
(CONSTANT)						-1.932053	

```
CPU TIME REQUIRED..     7.09 SECONDS

              40 FREQUENCIES     GENERAL = COMB
              41 STATISTICS      ALL
              42 OPTIONS         3,7,8
              43 COMMENT         ANALYSIS OF THE VALUES OF COMB FOR
              44 COMMENT         LT'S AND LCDR'S

GIVEN WORKSPACE ALLOWS FOR  19200 VALUES AND   5760 LABELS PER VARIABLE FOR 'FREQUENCIES'
```

```
11/12/81          FILE - THESIS    - CREATED 09/30/81

COMB

     CODE
           I
       2.  ********************************* (     123)
           I
           I
           I
       3.  ************ (     47)
           I
           I
           I
       4.  **************** (     61)
           I
           I
           I
       5.  ************ (     47)
           I
           I
           I
       6.  ************************************ (     134)
           I
           I
           I
       7.  ***************** (     63)
           I
           I
           I
       8.  ******************** (     76)
           I
           I
           I
       9.  *********** (     43)
           I
           I
           I
      10.  ************************** (     100)
           I
           I
           I
      18.  ** (      2)
           I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        40        80       120       160       200
           FREQUENCY

MEAN            5.951     STD ERR       0.105     MEDIAN        6.022
MODE            6.000     STD DEV       2.767     VARIANCE      7.658
KURTOSIS       -0.325     SKEWNESS      0.190     RANGE        16.000
MINIMUM         2.000     MAXIMUM      18.000

VALID CASES       696     MISSING CASES     0
```

```
CPU TIME REQUIRED..    0.19 SECONDS

        45 *SELECT IF       (RANK GT 2 AND RANK LT 5)
        46 FREQUENCIES      GENERAL = COMB
        47 STATISTICS       ALL
        48 COMMENT          ANALYSIS OF THE VALUES OF COMB FOR THE FAILED
        49 COMMENT          OF SELECTION GROUP

GIVEN WORKSPACE ALLOWS FOR  19200 VALUES AND   5760 LABELS PER VARIABLE FOR 'FREQUENCIES'
```

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

COMB

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	2.	70	18.3	18.3	18.3
	3.	26	6.8	6.8	25.1
	4.	41	10.7	10.7	35.9
	5.	26	6.8	6.8	42.7
	6.	80	20.9	20.9	63.6
	7.	40	10.5	10.5	74.1
	8.	40	10.5	10.5	04.6
	9.	17	4.5	4.5	89.0
	10.	40	10.5	10.5	99.5
	18.	2	0.5	0.5	100.0
	TOTAL	382	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.709	STD ERR	0.139	MEDIAN	5.850
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	2.707	VARIANCE	7.330
KURTOSIS	0.818	SKEWNESS	0.498	RANGE	16.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	18.000		

VALID CASES 382 MISSING CASES 0

```
TRANSPACE REQUIRED..        100 BYTES
      1 TRANSFORMATIONS
      0 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES
      7 IF/COMPUTE OPERATIONS

CPU TIME REQUIRED..     0.22 SECONDS


                   50 *SELECT IF      ((YRSINGRD GT 3 AND RANK EQ 2) OR
                   51                  (YRSINGRD GT 5 AND RANK EQ 3) OR
                   52                  (YRSINGRD GT 6 AND RANK EQ 4))
                   53 FREQUENCIES     GENERAL= COMB
                   54 STATISTICS      ALL
                   55 OPTIONS         3,7,8
                   56 COMMENT         HYPOTHESIS 4 - ANALYSIS ********************************************
                   57 COMMENT         SEE REGRESSION ANALYSIS DONE FOR HYPOTHESIS 2
                   58 COMMENT         ANALYSIS EXCLUDING SENIOR OFFICERS

GIVEN WORKSPACE ALLOWS FOR  19200 VALUES AND   5760 LABELS PER VARIABLE FOR 'FREQUENCIES'
```

COMB

```
      CODE
           I
        2. ***************  (      3)
           I
           I
           I
        3. **********  (      2)
           I
           I
           I
        4. *****  (      1)
           I
           I
           I
        5. **********  (      2)
           I
           I
           I
        6. ***************  (      3)
           I
           I
           I
        8. *****  (      1)
           I
           I
           I
        9. *****  (      1)
           I
           I
           I
       10. *****  (      1)
           I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0         2         4         6         8        10
           FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	5.071	STD ERR	0.699	MEDIAN	5.000
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	2.615	VARIANCE	6.841
KURTOSIS	-0.679	SKEWNESS	0.511	RANGE	8.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	10.000		

VALID CASES 14 MISSING CASES 0

```
TRANSPACE REQUIRED..       152 BYTES
      1 TRANSFORMATIONS
      0 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES
     23 IF/COMPUTE OPERATIONS

CPU TIME REQUIRED..     0.26 SECONDS


                59 *SELECT IF      (RANK LE 4)
                60 PEARSON CORR    RANK WITH COMB
                61 COMMENT         HYPOTHESIS 5 - ANALYSIS ****************************************
                62 COMMENT         SEE REGRESSION ANALYSIS DONE FOR HYPOTHESIS 2
                63 COMMENT         HYPOTHESIS 6 - ANALYSIS ****************************************
                64 COMMENT         ANALYSIS OF RESPSONSES TO TOUR LENGTH ITEMS
                65 COMMENT         SURV04 " WITH THE EXCEPTION OF OUT OF CONUS
                66 COMMENT         TOURS, I FEEL THAT THE AVERAGE TOUR LENGTH
                67 COMMENT         AT PRESENT SHOULD BE:"
                68 COMMENT         LONGER        ABOUT THE SAME         SHORTER
                69 COMMENT         SURV16 "I FEEL THAT, GENERALLY, THE BEST TOUR
                70 COMMENT         LENGTH FOR AN AVIATION DUTY STANDER AT AN
                71 COMMENT         AIR STATION IS:"
                72 COMMENT         6YRS OR MORE   5YRS  4YRS  3YRS  2YRS OR LESS

 ***** PEARSON CORR PROBLEM REQUIRES       48 BYTES WORKSPACE *****
```

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

```
- - - - - - - - - - - - P E A R S O N   C O R R E L A T I O N   C O E F F I C I E N T S - - - - - - - - - - - -

              COMB

RANK          0.2418
             (  500)
             P=0.000

(COEFFICIENT / (CASES) / SIGNIFICANCE)      (A VALUE OF 99.0000 IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED)
```

```
TRANSPACE REQUIRED..      100 BYTES
      1 TRANSFORMATIONS
      0 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES
      3 IF/COMPUTE OPERATIONS

CPU TIME REQUIRED..    0.22 SECONDS


                 73 PEARSON CORR   COMB WITH SURV16
  ***** PEARSON CORR PROBLEM REQUIRES       48 BYTES WORKSPACE *****
```

FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 09/30/81)

\- - - - - - - - - - - - P E A R S O N   C O R R E L A T I O N   C O E F F I C I E N T S - - - - - - - - - - - -

	SURV16
COMB	0.2067 (694) P=0.000

(COEFFICIENT / (CASES) / SIGNIFICANCE)   (A VALUE OF 99.0000 IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED)

```
CPU TIME REQUIRED..     0.22 SECONDS

                74 FREQUENCIES     GENERAL = SURV04,SURV16
                75 STATISTICS      ALL
                76 OPTIONS         3,7,8
                77 COMMENT         HYPOTHESIS 7 - ANALYSIS ****************************************
                78 COMMENT         SEE REGRESSION ANALYSIS DONE FOR HYPOTHESIS 2
                79 COMMENT         HYPOTHESIS 8 - ANALYSIS ****************************************
                80 COMMENT         REGRESSION ANALYSIS DONE IN A SEPERATE PROGRAM
                81 COMMENT         SEE FOLLOWING APPENDIX

GIVEN WORKSPACE ALLOWS FOR  19200 VALUES AND   5760 LABELS PER VARIABLE FOR 'FREQUENCIES'
```

```
11/12/81          FILE - THESIS   - CREATED 09/30/81

SURV04     AVERAGE TOUR LENGHT SHOULD BE___

     CODE
            I
        1.  ******************************************************* (    449)
            I   LONGER
            I
            I
        2.  *************************** (    234)
            I   ABOUT THE SAME
            I
            I
        3.  ** (      5)
            I   SHORTER
            I
            I
        9.  ** (      8)
  (MISSING) I
            I
            I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
            0        100       200       300       400       500
            FREQUENCY

MEAN            1.355     STD ERR       0.019     MEDIAN        1.266
MODE            1.000     STD DEV       0.494     VARIANCE      0.244
KURTOSIS       -0.929     SKEWNESS      0.790     RANGE         2.000
MINIMUM         1.000     MAXIMUM       3.000

VALID CASES       688     MISSING CASES     8
```

```
11/12/81          FILE - THESIS   - CREATED 09/30/81

SURV16     BEST TOUR LENGTH IS______

     CODE
          I
      1.  ********  (    68)
          I  6 YEARS OR MORE
          I
          I
      2.  **************  (   133)
          I  5 YEARS
          I
          I
      3.  **************************************  (   380)
          I  FOUR YEARS
          I
          I
      4.  ***********  (   108)
          I  THREE YEARS
          I
          I
      5.  **  (    5)
          I  TWO YEARS OR LESS
          I
          I
      9.  *  (    2)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

MEAN          2.782     STD ERR       0.032     MEDIAN        2.884
MODE          3.000     STD DEV       0.850     VARIANCE      0.722
KURTOSIS      0.048     SKEWNESS     -0.461     RANGE         4.000
MINIMUM       1.000     MAXIMUM       5.000

VALID CASES     694     MISSING CASES     2
```

```
CPU TIME REQUIRED..     0.20 SECONDS

          82 FINISH

     NORMAL END OF JOB.
        82 CONTROL CARDS WERE PROCESSED.
         0 ERRORS WERE DETECTED.
```

APPENDIX C

SPSS ANALYSIS PROGRAM AND OUTPUT FOR HYPOTHESIS 8

Notes:

1. Because of the limitations of the SPSS package, two preliminary regression analyses were done to identify significant contributors. These two are not included in this appendix. The regression herein is the last one mentioned in the text and includes significant variables from the two previous analyses.

2. Data retained on magnetic tape by Commandant (G-P-1/2) U.S. Coast Guard.

```
SPSS BATCH SYSTEM                                                                              11/09/81        PAGE    1
SPSS FOR OS/360, VERSION H, RELEASE 8.1, MAY 20, 1980
                                      CURRENT DOCUMENTATION FOR THE SPSS BATCH SYSTEM
ORDER FROM MCGRAW-HILL:  SPSS, 2ND ED. (PRINCIPAL TEXT)       ORDER FROM SPSS INC.:  SPSS STATISTICAL ALGORITHMS
                         SPSS PRIMER (BRIEF INTRO TO SPSS)                            SPSS POCKET GUIDE, RELEASE 8
                         SPSS UPDATE (USE W/SPSS,2ND FOR REL. 7 & 8)                  KEYWORDS: THE SPSS INC. NEWSLETTER

DEFAULT SPACE ALLOCATION..     ALLOWS FOR..   384 TRANSFORMATIONS
WORKSPACE    268800 BYTES                    1536 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES
TRANSPACE     38400 BYTES                    6144 IF/COMPUTE OPERATIONS

                    1 GET FILE SCII

EXPECTED FILE           FOUND FILE SCII


                              FILE SCII     HAS 246 VARIABLES

                              THE SUBFILES ARE..

                                         NO OF
                              NAME       CASES

                              SCII         103


CPU TIME REQUIRED..     0.02 SECONDS


                    2 REGRESSION      VARIABLES = COMB,
                    3                 STSCR001 TO STSCR029,
                    4                 STSCR044,STSCR152, STSCR122,STSCR108,STSCR170,STSCR054,
                    5                 STSCR069,STSCR132, STSCR163,STSCR223,STSCR189,STSCR079,
                    6                 STSCR051,STSCR176, STSCR235/
                    7                 REGRESSION = COMB (20,4.00,.8) WITH
                    8                 STSCR001 TO STSCR029,
                    9                 STSCR044,STSCR152, STSCR122,STSCR108,STSCR170,STSCR054,
                   10                 STSCR069,STSCR132, STSCR163,STSCR223,STSCR189,STSCR079,
                   11                 STSCR051,STSCR176, STSCR235

 ***** REGRESSION PROBLEM REQUIRES  35280 BYTES WORKSPACE, NOT INCLUDING RESIDUALS *****
```

FILE SCII (CREATION DATE = 10/05/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 1.. STSCR044

MULTIPLE R	0.25124	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
R SQUARE	0.06312	REGRESSION	1.	44.69691	44.69691	6.80473
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.05384	RESIDUAL	101.	663.41959	6.56851	
STANDARD ERROR	2.56291					

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
STSCR044	-0.2432531D-01	-0.25124	0.00933	6.805
(CONSTANT)	6.409425			

------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
STSCR001	-0.05587	-0.05757	0.99480	0.333
STSCR002	-0.06214	-0.06413	0.99782	0.413
STSCR003	0.03787	0.03891	0.98945	0.152
STSCR004	0.03441	0.03551	0.99792	0.126
STSCR005	-0.19499	-0.19648	0.95131	4.016
STSCR006	-0.01943	-0.02005	0.99830	0.040
STSCR007	-0.09095	-0.09385	0.99766	0.889
STSCR008	0.12243	0.12595	0.99150	1.612
STSCR009	-0.11922	-0.12163	0.97501	1.501
STSCR010	0.08001	0.08265	0.99989	0.688
STSCR011	0.01843	0.01903	0.99898	0.036
STSCR012	-0.13157	-0.13586	0.99897	1.881
STSCR013	-0.01031	-0.01065	0.99951	0.011
STSCR014	-0.09027	-0.09200	0.97323	0.854
STSCR015	-0.08649	-0.08933	0.99947	0.804
STSCR016	-0.11728	-0.12116	0.99999	1.490
STSCR017	0.03361	0.03449	0.98624	0.119
STSCR018	0.08294	0.08464	0.97576	0.722
STSCR019	-0.10978	-0.11341	0.99997	1.303
STSCR020	0.00352	0.00363	0.99965	0.001
STSCR021	-0.02930	-0.03008	0.98798	0.091
STSCR022	0.08530	0.08711	0.97718	0.765
STSCR023	0.06322	0.06501	0.99071	0.424
STSCR024	-0.06058	-0.06238	0.99350	0.391
STSCR025	-0.00594	-0.00613	0.99935	0.004
STSCR026	0.14835	0.15285	0.99456	2.392
STSCR027	0.02645	0.02676	0.95856	0.072
STSCR028	-0.09023	-0.09130	0.95918	0.841
STSCR029	-0.17571	-0.17889	0.97101	3.306
STSCR152	0.20533	0.20763	0.95796	4.505
STSCR122	-0.19716	-0.20344	0.99749	4.318
STSCR108	-0.15967	-0.16293	0.97546	2.727
STSCR170	-0.14692	-0.15075	0.98632	2.325
STSCR054	0.14427	0.14880	0.99666	2.264
STSCR069	0.13043	0.13434	0.99379	1.838
STSCR132	-0.10682	-0.11017	0.99650	1.229
STSCR163	0.13845	0.14303	0.99987	2.088
STSCR223	0.14114	0.14550	0.99559	2.163
STSCR189	0.08461	0.08527	0.95140	0.732
STSCR079	-0.05407	-0.05548	0.98638	0.309
STSCR051	-0.13790	-0.14247	1.00000	2.072
STSCR176	0.12703	0.13122	0.99972	1.752
STSCR235	0.12941	0.13363	0.99900	1.818

FILE SCII (CREATION DATE = 10/05/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB.

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 2.. STSCR152

MULTIPLE R	0.32173
R SQUARE	0.10351
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.08558
STANDARD ERROR	2.51956

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	2.	73.29594	36.64797	5.77296
RESIDUAL	100.	634.82057	6.34821	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
STSCR044	-0.2024911D-01	-0.20914	0.00937	4.674
STSCR152	0.1898324D-01	0.20533	0.00894	4.505
(CONSTANT)	5.204981			

------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
STSCR001	-0.02493	-0.02593	0.97040	0.067
STSCR002	-0.05225	-0.05506	0.99535	0.301
STSCR003	0.04261	0.04475	0.98891	0.199
STSCR004	0.03276	0.03456	0.99785	0.118
STSCR005	-0.19540	-0.20129	0.95131	4.181
STSCR006	-0.03507	-0.03690	0.99242	0.135
STSCR007	-0.06895	-0.07227	0.98475	0.520
STSCR008	0.13897	0.14571	0.98551	2.147
STSCR009	-0.12914	-0.13452	0.97283	1.825
STSCR010	0.11689	0.12171	0.97191	1.489
STSCR011	0.01562	0.01649	0.99879	0.027
STSCR012	-0.12192	-0.12854	0.99652	1.663
STSCR013	-0.00157	-0.00166	0.99762	0.000
STSCR014	-0.10527	-0.10940	0.96832	1.199
STSCR015	-0.05241	-0.05446	0.96788	0.295
STSCR016	-0.11958	-0.12628	0.99986	1.604
STSCR017	0.06272	0.06516	0.96748	0.422
STSCR018	0.07987	0.08332	0.97554	0.692
STSCR019	-0.09634	-0.10151	0.99519	1.031
STSCR020	0.01799	0.01895	0.99453	0.036
STSCR021	0.01662	0.01701	0.93884	0.029
STSCR022	0.06233	0.06463	0.96376	0.415
STSCR023	0.07604	0.07978	0.98690	0.634
STSCR024	-0.04538	-0.04764	0.98766	0.225
STSCR025	-0.00915	-0.00965	0.99910	0.009
STSCR026	0.16838	0.17659	0.98610	3.187
STSCR027	0.05527	0.05663	0.94097	0.318
STSCR028	-0.06570	-0.06743	0.94431	0.452
STSCR029	-0.14853	-0.15285	0.94929	2.368
STSCR122	-0.21879	-0.22970	0.98807	5.514
STSCR108	-0.20455	-0.20965	0.94177	4.552
STSCR170	-0.13672	-0.14321	0.98362	2.073
STSCR054	0.13333	0.14036	0.99348	1.990
STSCR069	0.13326	0.14029	0.99359	1.988
STSCR132	-0.09728	-0.10244	0.99415	1.050
STSCR163	0.13946	0.14728	0.99985	2.195
STSCR223	0.13834	0.14577	0.99539	2.149
STSCR189	0.09409	0.09683	0.94947	0.937
STSCR079	-0.01121	-0.01148	0.94105	0.013
STSCR051	-0.13330	-0.14075	0.99946	2.001
STSCR176	0.08422	0.08641	0.94384	0.745
STSCR235	0.10939	0.11483	0.98786	1.323

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 3.. STSCR122

MULTIPLE R	0.38834
R SQUARE	0.15081
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.12507
STANDARD ERROR	2.46455

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	3.	106.78895	35.59632	5.86043
RESIDUAL	99.	601.32755	6.07402	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
STSCR044	-0.1875733D-01	-0.19373	0.00918	4.171
STSCR152	0.2098971D-01	0.22703	0.00879	5.702
STSCR122	-0.1970639D-01	-0.21879	0.00839	5.514
(CONSTANT)	6.076534			

------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
STSCR001	0.02250	0.02352	0.92748	0.054
STSCR002	-0.03254	-0.03508	0.98699	0.121
STSCR003	0.04361	0.04706	0.98889	0.218
STSCR004	0.02347	0.02542	0.99602	0.063
STSCR005	-0.17667	-0.18622	0.94352	3.521
STSCR006	-0.04331	-0.04679	0.99103	0.215
STSCR007	-0.09790	-0.10459	0.96934	1.084
STSCR008	0.12856	0.13833	0.98315	1.912
STSCR009	-0.13756	-0.14713	0.97147	2.168
STSCR010	0.13203	0.14094	0.96768	1.986
STSCR011	-0.00667	-0.00719	0.98838	0.005
STSCR012	-0.08951	-0.09573	0.97127	0.906
STSCR013	-0.00036	-0.00040	0.99759	0.000
STSCR014	-0.08706	-0.09262	0.96129	0.848
STSCR015	-0.01532	-0.01612	0.93998	0.025
STSCR016	-0.11879	-0.12890	0.99985	1.656
STSCR017	0.06177	0.06593	0.96746	0.428
STSCR018	0.09836	0.10507	0.96913	1.094
STSCR019	-0.10048	-0.10875	0.99484	1.173
STSCR020	0.01550	0.01677	0.99440	0.028
STSCR021	0.03731	0.03907	0.93110	0.150
STSCR022	0.03302	0.03485	0.94619	0.119
STSCR023	0.05674	0.06092	0.97886	0.365
STSCR024	-0.01985	-0.02126	0.97392	0.044
STSCR025	-0.00055	-0.00060	0.99754	0.000
STSCR026	0.21980	0.23226	0.94815	5.588
STSCR027	0.06813	0.07160	0.93798	0.505
STSCR028	-0.02964	-0.03083	0.91869	0.093
STSCR029	-0.13695	-0.14459	0.94656	2.093
STSCR108	-0.22157	-0.23275	0.93703	5.613
STSCR170	-0.15458	-0.16587	0.97775	2.772
STSCR054	0.16075	0.17270	0.98017	3.013
STSCR069	0.16018	0.17214	0.98071	2.993
STSCR132	-0.12045	-0.12966	0.98409	1.676
STSCR163	0.14072	0.15269	0.99982	2.339
STSCR223	0.12114	0.13070	0.98858	1.703
STSCR189	0.07792	0.08216	0.94422	0.666
STSCR079	0.02993	0.03100	0.91082	0.094
STSCR051	-0.15419	-0.16659	0.99132	2.797
STSCR176	0.09064	0.09552	0.94308	0.902
STSCR235	0.10067	0.10849	0.98623	1.167

SPSS BATCH SYSTEM 11/09/81 PAGE 5

FILE SCII (CREATION DATE = 10/05/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 4.. STSCR108

MULTIPLE R	0.44363
R SQUARE	0.19681
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.16403
STANDARD ERROR	2.40906

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	4.	139.36449	34.84112	6.00337
RESIDUAL	98.	568.75202	5.80359	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
STSCR044	-0.1446721B-01	-0.14942	0.00916	2.496
STSCR152	0.2497197D-01	0.27010	0.00876	8.136
STSCR122	-C.2108925D-01	-0.23415	0.00822	6.576
STSCR108	-0.1892951D-01	-0.22157	0.00799	5.613
(CONSTANT)	6.548184			

------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
STSCR001	0.05507	0.05858	0.90896	0.334
STSCR002	-0.03756	-0.04163	0.98646	0.168
STSCR003	0.01770	0.01950	0.97433	0.037
STSCR004	0.03094	0.03444	0.99483	0.115
STSCR005	-0.15292	-0.16460	0.93059	2.701
STSCR006	-0.03691	-0.04098	0.99015	0.163
STSCR007	-0.11521	-0.12620	0.96369	1.570
STSCR008	0.14205	0.15688	0.97961	2.448
STSCR009	-0.11325	-0.12366	0.95769	1.506
STSCR010	0.12177	0.13350	0.96541	1.760
STSCR011	0.00417	0.00462	0.98589	0.002
STSCR012	-0.06603	-0.07216	0.95917	0.508
STSCR013	0.03733	C.04099	0.96860	0.163
STSCR014	-0.07140	-0.07790	0.95612	0.592
STSCR015	-0.01865	-0.02017	0.93977	0.039
STSCR016	-0.14156	-0.15716	0.98993	2.456
STSCR017	0.01968	0.02118	0.93010	0.044
STSCR018	0.08885	0.09750	0.96722	0.931
STSCR019	-0.07866	-0.08705	0.98376	0.741
STSCR020	-0.00799	-0.00884	0.98263	0.008
STSCR021	0.00740	0.00790	0.91409	0.006
STSCR022	0.00875	0.00944	0.93463	0.009
STSCR023	0.05660	0.06249	0.97886	0.380
STSCR024	0.01517	0.01649	0.94920	0.026
STSCR025	-0.01995	-0.02215	0.98953	0.048
STSCR026	0.23779	0.25762	0.94274	6.896
STSCR027	0.04813	0.05179	0.93001	0.261
STSCR028	-0.02354	-0.02516	0.91800	0.061
STSCR029	-0.14163	-0.15371	0.94614	2.347
STSCR170	-0.15958	-0.17602	0.97725	3.102
STSCR054	0.15042	0.16556	0.97778	2.747
STSCR069	0.14159	0.15580	0.97253	2.413
STSCR132	-0.13000	-0.14377	0.98226	2.047
STSCR163	0.11412	0.12619	0.98201	1.569
STSCR223	0.09447	0.10391	0.97158	1.059
STSCR189	0.08713	0.09439	0.94262	0.872
STSCR079	0.04849	0.05147	0.90483	0.258
STSCR051	-0.11686	-0.12737	0.95415	1.600
STSCR176	0.09126	0.09889	0.94308	0.958
STSCR235	0.13079	0.14371	0.96973	2.045

FILE SCII (CREATION DATE = 10/05/81)

* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 5.. STSCR026

MULTIPLE R	0.50012
R SQUARE	0.25012
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.21146
STANDARD ERROR	2.33971

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F
REGRESSION	5.	177.11275	35.42255	6.47074
RESIDUAL	97.	531.00376	5.47427	

------------------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------------------

VARIABLE	B	BETA	STD ERROR B	F
STSCR044	-0.1165833D-01	-0.12041	0.00896	1.694
STSCR152	0.2779052D-01	0.30059	0.00857	10.514
STSCR122	-0.2539963D-01	-0.28200	0.00815	9.703
STSCR108	-0.2047272D-01	-0.23964	0.00778	6.921
STSCR026	0.2308372D-01	0.23779	0.00879	6.896
(CONSTANT)	5.414095			

------------- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -------------

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	TOLERANCE	F
STSCR001	0.06942	0.07630	0.90588	0.562
STSCR002	-0.05580	-0.06381	0.98060	0.392
STSCR003	0.01089	0.01241	0.97350	0.015
STSCR004	0.01757	0.02020	0.99148	0.039
STSCR005	-0.13908	-0.15466	0.92725	2.353
STSCR006	-0.04659	-0.05349	0.98845	0.275
STSCR007	-0.12366	-0.14010	0.96249	1.922
STSCR008	0.13692	0.15645	0.97912	2.409
STSCR009	-0.08969	-0.10080	0.94734	0.986
STSCR010	0.12529	0.14214	0.96520	1.980
STSCR011	0.04407	0.04983	0.95860	0.239
STSCR012	-0.04290	-0.04828	0.94959	0.224
STSCR013	0.07356	0.08269	0.94749	0.661
STSCR014	-0.03173	-0.03530	0.92784	0.120
STSCR015	-0.04417	-0.04917	0.92939	0.233
STSCR016	-0.12045	-0.13775	0.98085	1.857
STSCR017	-0.00278	-0.00309	0.92193	0.001
STSCR018	0.10286	0.11662	0.96394	1.324
STSCR019	-0.05310	-0.06044	0.97127	0.352
STSCR020	-0.01176	-0.01346	0.98238	0.017
STSCR021	-0.01344	-0.01479	0.90734	0.021
STSCR022	-0.01376	-0.01530	0.92641	0.022
STSCR023	0.04778	0.05455	0.97744	0.287
STSCR024	0.05627	0.06242	0.92277	0.376
STSCR025	-0.01961	-0.02252	0.98953	0.049
STSCR027	0.05587	0.06219	0.92905	0.373
STSCR028	-0.03988	-0.04403	0.91387	0.186
STSCR029	-0.11142	-0.12399	0.92866	1.499
STSCR170	-0.14901	-0.16992	0.97513	2.854
STSCR054	0.15371	0.17550	0.97759	3.051
STSCR069	0.14592	0.16615	0.97221	2.725
STSCR132	-0.16677	-0.18891	0.96213	3.553
STSCR163	0.11290	0.12919	0.98198	1.629
STSCR223	0.10956	0.12446	0.96778	1.510
STSCR189	0.05491	0.06096	0.92415	0.358
STSCR079	0.05134	0.05639	0.90470	0.306
STSCR051	-0.09054	-0.10143	0.94119	0.998
STSCR176	0.07631	0.08540	0.93919	0.705
STSCR235	0.12876	0.14642	0.96966	2.103

F-LEVEL OR TOLERANCE-LEVEL INSUFFICIENT FOR FURTHER COMPUTATION

STATISTICS WHICH CANNOT BE COMPUTED ARE PRINTED AS ALL NINES.

SPSS BATCH SYSTEM 11/09/81 PAGE 7

FILE SCII (CREATION DATE = 10/05/81)

* M U L T I P L E   R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * * VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. COMB

SUMMARY TABLE

VARIABLE	MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	RSQ CHANGE	SIMPLE R	B	BETA
STSCR044	0.25124	0.06312	0.06312	-0.25124	-0.1165833D-01	-0.12041
STSCR152	0.32173	0.10351	0.04039	0.24821	0.2779052D-01	0.30059
STSCR122	0.38834	0.15081	0.04730	-0.20925	-0.2539963D-01	-0.28200
STSCR108	0.44363	0.19681	0.04600	-0.19511	-0.2047272D-01	-0.23964
STSCR026	0.50012	0.25012	0.05331	0.16607	0.2308372D-01	0.23779
(CONSTANT)					5.414095	

```
CPU TIME REQUIRED..    0.61 SECONDS

          12 FINISH

     NORMAL END OF JOB.
        12 CONTROL CARDS WERE PROCESSED.
         0 ERRORS WERE DETECTED.
```

APPENDIX D

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR RESPONSES TO ALL QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Note: Missing values not included in calculation of distribution statistics.

```
AGE        AGE OF RESPONDENT

     CODE
           I
      24.  ** (      1)
           I
           I
           I
      25.  ********* (     15)
           I
           I
           I
      26.  *********** (     20)
           I
           I
           I
      27.  ******************* (     35)
           I
           I
           I
      28.  ****************** (     33)
           I
           I
           I
      29.  ************ (     22)
           I
           I
           I
      30.  ****************** (     34)
           I
           I
           I
      31.  ********************* (     39)
           I
           I
           I
      32.  *************************** (     51)
           I
           I
           I
      33.  ************************* (     47)
           I
           I
           I
      34.  ****************************** (     57)
           I
           I
           I
      35.  ******************* (     35)
           I
           I
           I
      36.  *************** (     28)
           I
           I
           I
      37.  ******************* (     36)
           I
           I
           I
      38.  ***************** (     32)
           I
           I
           I
      39.  **************** (     30)
           I
           I
```

```
          I
     40.  ****************** (      33)
          I
          I
          I
     41.  ************** (      25)
          I
          I
          I
     42.  ************ (      22)
          I
          I
          I
     43.  *********** (      20)
          I
          I
          I
     44.  ********* (      16)
          I
          I
          I
     45.  ******** (      13)
          I
          I
          I
     46.  ******** (      14)
          I
          I
          I
     47.  ******* (      11)
          I
          I
          I
     48.  ***** (       8)
          I
          I
          I
     49.  ***** (       8)
          I
          I
          I
     50.  *** (       3)
          I
          I
          I
     51.  ** (       2)
          I
          I
          I
     52.  *** (       3)
          I
          I
          I
     53.  ** (       1)
          I
          I
          I
      0.  ** (       1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I
     99.  ** (       1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        20        40        60        80       100
          FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	35.365	STD ERR	0.233	MEDIAN	34.377
MODE	34.000	STD DEV	6.145	VARIANCE	37.764
KURTOSIS	-0.459	SKEWNESS	0.430	RANGE	29.000
MINIMUM	24.000	MAXIMUM	53.000		

VALID CASES 694 MISSING CASES 2

```
RANK      RANK

    CODE
         I
     1.  *** (      6)
         I  ENS
         I
         I
     2.  ***************************** (    112)
         I  LTJG
         I
         I
     3.  *************************************************** (    199)
         I  LTO3
         I
         I
     4.  *********************************************** (    183)
         I  LCDR
         I
         I
     5.  *********************************** (    136)
         I  CDR
         I
         I
     6.  **************** (     60)
         I  CAPT
         I
         I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
         0        40        80       120       160       200
         FREQUENCY

MEAN           3.734      STD ERR       0.046      MEDIAN          3.669
MODE           3.000      STD DEV       1.216      VARIANCE        1.479
KURTOSIS      -0.798      SKEWNESS      0.154      RANGE           5.000
MINIMUM        1.000      MAXIMUM       6.000

VALID CASES      696      MISSING CASES     0
```

YRSINGRD YEARS IN GRADE

```
     CODE
           I
       1.  ************************************** (     153)
           I
           I
           I
       2.  ******************************************* (     171)
           I
           I
           I
       3.  ************************************** (     152)
           I
           I
           I
       4.  *************************** (     106)
           I
           I
           I
       5.  ************** (      53)
           I
           I
           I
       6.  ******** (      29)
           I
           I
           I
       7.  ***** (      14)
           I
           I
           I
       8.  *** (       9)
           I
           I
           I
       9.  *** (       8)
           I
           I
           I
       0.  * (       1)
 (MISSING) I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        40        80       120       160       200
           FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	2.958	STD ERR	0.066	MEDIAN	2.655
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	1.739	VARIANCE	3.023
KURTOSIS	1.144	SKEWNESS	1.081	RANGE	8.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	9.000		

VALID CASES 695 MISSING CASES 1

```
YRSAVITR  YEARS AS AN AVIATIOR

     CODE
          I
      1.  ******* (     12)
          I
          I
          I
      2.  ****************** (     33)
          I
          I
          I
      3.  ***************** (     32)
          I
          I
          I
      4.  **************** (     29)
          I
          I
          I
      5.  ******************* (     36)
          I
          I
          I
      6.  *************** (     28)
          I
          I
          I
      7.  ***************** (     32)
          I
          I
          I
      8.  ****************** (     33)
          I
          I
          I
      9.  ******************** (     38)
          I
          I
          I
     10.  ************************* (     48)
          I
          I
          I
     11.  ******************** (     37)
          I
          I
          I
     12.  *************************** (     52)
          I
          I
          I
     13.  ************************ (     46)
          I
          I
          I
     14.  ************************ (     46)
          I
          I
          I
     15.  ********************** (     41)
          I
          I
          I
     16.  **************** (     30)
          I
          I
```

```
          I
     17.  *********** (     19)
          I
          I
          I
     18.  ********** (     17)
          I
          I
          I
     19.  ******** (     13)
          I
          I
          I
     20.  ************* (     23)
          I
          I
          I
     21.  ****** (     10)
          I
          I
          I
     22.  ****** (     10)
          I
          I
          I
     23.  ****** (     10)
          I
          I
          I
     24.  ****** (      9)
          I
          I
          I
     25.  ***** (      7)
          I
          I
          I
     26.  ** (      2)
          I
          I
          I
     27.  ** (      2)
          I
          I
          I
     80.  ** (      1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        20        40        60        80       100
          FREQUENCY

MEAN          11.236      STD ERR        0.223      MEDIAN        11.216
MODE          12.000      STD DEV        5.891      VARIANCE      34.699
KURTOSIS      -0.501      SKEWNESS       0.296      RANGE         26.000
MINIMUM        1.000      MAXIMUM       27.000

VALID CASES      695      MISSING CASES      1
```

YRSERV TOTAL YEARS OF SERVICE

```
     CODE
            I
       2.   ****** (        5)
            I
            I
            I
       3.   ******** (        7)
            I
            I
            I
       4.   ************************* (       24)
            I
            I
            I
       5.   *********************************** (       34)
            I
            I
            I
       6.   **************************** (       27)
            I
            I
            I
       7.   ************************** (       25)
            I
            I
            I
       8.   ********************************* (       32)
            I
            I
            I
       9.   **************************************** (       39)
            I
            I
            I
      10.   ************************************************* (       48)
            I
            I
            I
      11.   ************************************************** (       49)
            I
            I
            I
      12.   ******************************** (       31)
            I
            I
            I
      13.   ******************************************** (       43)
            I
            I
            I
      14.   ********************************* (       32)
            I
            I
            I
      15.   *********************************** (       34)
            I
            I
            I
      16.   **************************************** (       39)
            I
            I
            I
      17.   ************************** (       25)
            I
            I
```

```
        I
    18. ***************************** (     28)
        I
        I
        I
    19. ***************************** (     28)
        I
        I
        I
    20. ******************************* (     30)
        I
        I
        I
    21. ***************** (     16)
        I
        I
        I
    22. *********************** (     22)
        I
        I
        I
    23. ************** (     13)
        I
        I
        I
    24. ************* (     12)
        I
        I
        I
    25. ****************** (     17)
        I
        I
        I
    26. ********* (      8)
        I
        I
        I
    27. ************ (     11)
        I
        I
        I
    28. ****** (      5)
        I
        I
        I
    29. **** (      3)
        I
        I
        I
    30. ******** (      7)
        I
        I
        I
    32. ** (      1)
        I
        I
        I
    34. ** (      1)
        I
        I
        I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
        0        10        20        30        40        50
        FREQUENCY

MEAN          13.899      STD ERR       0.247      MEDIAN        13.128
MODE          11.000      STD DEV       6.515      VARIANCE      42.442
KURTOSIS      -0.475      SKEWNESS      0.424      RANGE         32.000
MINIMUM        2.000      MAXIMUM      34.000

VALID CASES      696      MISSING CASES      0
```

OBLSERV COMPLETED OBLIGATED SERVICE

```
     CODE
           I
       0.  ************************************************ (    481)
           I   YES
           I
           I
       1.  ********************** (    215)
           I   NO
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        100       200       300       400       500
           FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	0.309	STD ERR	0.018	MEDIAN	0.223
MODE	0.0	STD DEV	0.462	VARIANCE	0.214
KURTOSIS	-1.317	SKEWNESS	0.829	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	0.0	MAXIMUM	1.000		

VALID CASES 696 MISSING CASES 0

```
COMMSRCE  SOURCE OF COMMISSION

     CODE
          I
      1.  ************** (    130)
          I  OCS
          I
          I
      2.  *********** (    100)
          I  OCS PRIOR ENLISTED
          I
          I
      3.  ******************************** (    296)
          I  CG ACADEMY
          I
          I
      4.  **** (     33)
          I  AVCAD PROGRAM
          I
          I
      5.  ******* (     63)
          I  DCA ARMY
          I
          I
      6.  *** (     18)
          I  DCA NAVY
          I
          I
      7.  *** (     20)
          I  DCA AIR FORCE
          I
          I
      8.  *** (     24)
          I  DCA MARINES
          I
          I
      9.  ** (     12)
          I  OTHER COMMISION SOURCE
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

MEAN          3.180     STD ERR       0.070     MEDIAN        2.899
MODE          3.000     STD DEV       1.857     VARIANCE      3.448
KURTOSIS      1.377     SKEWNESS      1.230     RANGE         8.000
MINIMUM       1.000     MAXIMUM       9.000

VALID CASES     696     MISSING CASES     0
```

YRSCOLL YEARS OF COLLEGE OR EQUIVLENT

```
     CODE
          I
       0. ** (      7)
          I
          I
          I
       1. ** (     10)
          I
          I
          I
       2. ****** (     47)
          I
          I
          I
       3. ****** (     45)
          I
          I
          I
       4. ************************* (    235)
          I
          I
          I
       5. ******************* (    184)
          I
          I
          I
       6. ***************** (    158)
          I
          I
          I
       7. ** (     10)
          I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	4.478	STD ERR	0.049	MEDIAN	4.522
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.304	VARIANCE	1.700
KURTOSIS	0.775	SKEWNESS	-0.777	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	0.0	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 696 MISSING CASES 0

DEGREE TYPE OF COLLEGE DEGREE

```
     CODE
          I
       1. ********** (     86)
          I  NONE
          I
          I
       2. ** (      8)
          I  AA
          I
          I
       3. ** (     10)
          I  AS
          I
          I
       4. ********************************************** (    455)
          I  BS
          I
          I
       5. ****** (     48)
          I  BA BUSINESS
          I
          I
       6. ********** (     89)
          I  BA
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY
```

```
MEAN           3.917     STD ERR        0.050     MEDIAN         4.036
MODE           4.000     STD DEV        1.322     VARIANCE       1.748
KURTOSIS       0.824     SKEWNESS      -0.831     RANGE          5.000
MINIMUM        1.000     MAXIMUM        6.000

VALID CASES      696     MISSING CASES      0
```

```
PG         POSTGRADUATE STUDY

     CODE
           I
       0.  ********************************** (    330)
           I   NONE
           I
           I
       1.  ********************* (    198)
           I   SOME GRADUATE STUDY
           I
           I
       2.  ****************** (    168)
           I   DEGREE OBTAINED
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        100       200       300       400       500
           FREQUENCY

MEAN          0.767     STD ERR       0.031     MEDIAN        0.591
MODE          0.0       STD DEV       0.814     VARIANCE      0.662
KURTOSIS     -1.349     SKEWNESS      0.450     RANGE         2.000
MINIMUM       0.0       MAXIMUM       2.000

VALID CASES     696     MISSING CASES     0
```

```
PGDEG      TYPE OF POSTGRADUATE        DEGREE

     CODE
            I
       0.   *************************** (     508)
            I   NONE
            I
            I
       1.   *** (      41)
            I   MBA
            I
            I
       2.   ***** (      88)
            I   MS
            I
            I
       3.   *** (      47)
            I   MA
            I
            I
       4.   * (        1)
            I   LAW
            I
            I
       7.   * (        1)
            I   OTHER
            I
            I
       9.   ** (      10)
            I   PHD OR MORE THAN ONE MASTERS DEGREE
            I
            I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
            0        200       400       600       800      1000
            FREQUENCY

MEAN            0.659      STD ERR        0.054      MEDIAN          0.185
MODE            0.0        STD DEV        1.413      VARIANCE        1.998
KURTOSIS       15.873      SKEWNESS       3.458      RANGE           9.000
MINIMUM         0.0        MAXIMUM        9.000

VALID CASES      696       MISSING CASES      0
```

```
PGFUND    SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR POSTGRADUATE WORK

     CODE
          I
      0.  ************************************ (    339)
          I  NOT APPLICABLE
          I
          I
      1.  ************************** (    239)
          I  WENT ON OWN
          I
          I
      2.  ************* (    118)
          I  SENT BY COAST  GUARD
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

MEAN           0.682      STD ERR        0.028      MEDIAN         0.538
MODE           0.0        STD DEV        0.746      VARIANCE       0.557
KURTOSIS      -0.991      SKEWNESS       0.590      RANGE          2.000
MINIMUM        0.0        MAXIMUM        2.000

VALID CASES      696      MISSING CASES      0
```

FSO AVIATION SAFETY OFFICER

```
     CODE
           I
       0.  ******************************** (    587)
           I   NO
           I
           I
           I
       1.  ****** (    109)
           I   YES
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        200       400       600       800      1000
           FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	0.157	STD ERR	0.014	MEDIAN	0.093
MODE	0.0	STD DEV	0.364	VARIANCE	0.132
KURTOSIS	1.591	SKEWNESS	1.894	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	0.0	MAXIMUM	1.000		

VALID CASES 696 MISSING CASES 0

```
AMO        AVIATION MAINTENANCE OFFICER

     CODE
          I
       0. ****************************** (    584)
          I  NO
          I
          I
       1. ******* (    112)
          I  YES
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        200       400       600       800       1000
          FREQUENCY

MEAN          0.161     STD ERR       0.014     MEDIAN         0.096
MODE          0.0       STD DEV       0.368     VARIANCE       0.135
KURTOSIS      1.425     SKEWNESS      1.850     RANGE          1.000
MINIMUM       0.0       MAXIMUM       1.000

VALID CASES     696     MISSING CASES     0
```

```
ACFT      PRIMARY AIRCRAFT FLOWN

     CODE
          I
     1.   ****************************** (    287)
          I   HH-52
          I
          I
     2.   **************** (    150)
          I   HH-3F
          I
          I
     3.   ************** (    142)
          I   C-131 OR HU-16
          I
          I
     4.   ************ (    115)
          I   C-130
          I
          I
     9.   * (     2)
 (MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

MEAN          2.122     STD ERR       0.043     MEDIAN        1.900
MODE          1.000     STD DEV       1.126     VARIANCE      1.268
KURTOSIS     -1.230     SKEWNESS      0.457     RANGE         3.000
MINIMUM       1.000     MAXIMUM       4.000

VALID CASES     694     MISSING CASES     2
```

NOTOURS NUMBER OF TOURS SINCE FLIGHT SCHOOL

```
     CODE
          I
       1. *************************************** (    153)
          I
          I
          I
       2. ************************* (     99)
          I
          I
          I
       3. *********************** (     92)
          I
          I
          I
       4. **************************** (    110)
          I
          I
          I
       5. ********************** (     87)
          I
          I
          I
       6. ************* (     50)
          I
          I
          I
       7. ************ (     48)
          I
          I
          I
       8. ********* (     31)
          I
          I
          I
       9. ******* (     25)
          I  NINE OR MORE
          I
          I
       0. * (      1)
 (MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        40        80       120       160       200
          FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	3.757	STD ERR	0.087	MEDIAN	3.532
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	2.298	VARIANCE	5.279
KURTOSIS	-0.638	SKEWNESS	0.543	RANGE	8.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	9.000		

VALID CASES 695 MISSING CASES 1

NOFLTRS NUMBER OF DIFOPS TOURS

```
     CODE
          I
       1. ******************************************* (     153)
          I
          I
          I
       2. ********************************* (     126)
          I
          I
          I
       3. ****************************** (     115)
          I
          I
          I
       4. ******************************* (     119)
          I
          I
          I
       5. *********************** (      88)
          I
          I
          I
       6. ************** (      50)
          I
          I
          I
       7. ****** (      20)
          I
          I
          I
       8. ***** (      14)
          I
          I
          I
       9. ** (       5)
          I  NINE OR MORE
          I
          I
       0. *** (       6)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        40        80       120       160       200
          FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	3.280	STD ERR	0.072	MEDIAN	3.074
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.888	VARIANCE	3.563
KURTOSIS	-0.229	SKEWNESS	0.618	RANGE	8.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	9.000		

VALID CASES 690 MISSING CASES 6

HQ NUMBER OF HEADQUARTERS TOURS

```
     CODE
          I
       0. ***************************** (   558)
          I
          I
          I
       1. ******* (   115)
          I
          I
          I
       2. ** (    22)
          I
          I
          I
       9. * (     1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        200       400       600       800      1000
          FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	0.229	STD ERR	0.019	MEDIAN	0.123
MODE	0.0	STD DEV	0.490	VARIANCE	0.240
KURTOSIS	3.511	SKEWNESS	2.068	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	0.0	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 695 MISSING CASES 1

```
DIST      NUMBER OF DISTRICT OR AREA STAFF TOURS

     CODE
          I
       0. ******************************** (    637)
          I
          I
          I
       1. *** (    48)
          I
          I
          I
       2. * (     8)
          I
          I
          I
       3. * (     2)
          I
          I
          I
       9. * (     1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        200       400       600       800      1000
          FREQUENCY

MEAN           0.101      STD ERR       0.014      MEDIAN         0.046
MODE           0.0        STD DEV       0.362      VARIANCE       0.131
KURTOSIS      20.418      SKEWNESS      4.198      RANGE          3.000
MINIMUM        0.0        MAXIMUM       3.000

VALID CASES      695      MISSING CASES     1
```

```
PGWCOLL   NUMBER OF TOURS AT PG SCHOOL AND/OR WAR AND STAFF COLLEGES

     CODE
          I
       0. ********************************* (    612)
          I
          I
          I
       1. ***** (    78)
          I
          I
          I
       2. * (     5)
          I
          I
          I
       9. * (     1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        200       400       600       800      1000
          FREQUENCY

MEAN          0.127     STD ERR       0.013     MEDIAN        0.068
MODE          0.0       STD DEV       0.354     VARIANCE      0.125
KURTOSIS      6.927     SKEWNESS      2.728     RANGE         2.000
MINIMUM       0.0       MAXIMUM       2.000

VALID CASES     695     MISSING CASES     1
```

```
TOUROTH   OTHER TOURS

     CODE
            I
       0.   ********************************* (    632)
            I
            I
            I
       1.   **** (     53)
            I
            I
            I
       2.   ** (     10)
            I
            I
            I
       9.   * (      1)
(MISSING)   I
            I
            I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
            0        200       400       600       800      1000
            FREQUENCY

MEAN            0.105      STD ERR        0.013      MEDIAN         0.050
MODE            0.0        STD DEV        0.351      VARIANCE       0.123
KURTOSIS       12.659      SKEWNESS       3.529      RANGE          2.000
MINIMUM         0.0        MAXIMUM        2.000

VALID CASES       695      MISSING CASES       1
```

```
ASPOSIT   HIGHEST POSITION AT AIR STATION

     CODE
          I
       0. ********************************* (    309)
          I   DUTY
          I
          I
       1. ******* (     62)
          I   COMMANDING OFFICER
          I
          I
       2. ***** (     42)
          I   EXECUTIVE OFFICER
          I
          I
       3. ****** (     50)
          I   OPERATIONS OFFICER
          I
          I
       4. ******* (     58)
          I   ENGINEERING OFFICER
          I
          I
       5. ****************** (    174)
          I   DEPARTMENT HEAD
          I
          I
       9. * (      1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

MEAN              2.012      STD ERR        0.081      MEDIAN           1.121
MODE              0.0        STD DEV        2.129      VARIANCE         4.533
KURTOSIS         -1.601      SKEWNESS       0.385      RANGE            5.000
MINIMUM           0.0        MAXIMUM        5.000

VALID CASES       695        MISSING CASES      1
```

```
OPOSIT    HIGHEST POSITION HELD AT NON-AIR STATION

     CODE
          I
       0. ******************************** (    595)
          I   NOT APPLICABLE
          I
          I
       1. ** (     20)
          I   COMMANDING OFFICER
          I
          I
       2. ** (     23)
          I   EXECUTIVE OFFICER
          I
          I
       3. ** (     10)
          I   OPERATIONS OFFICER
          I
          I
       4. * (      3)
          I   ENGINEERING OFFICER
          I
          I
       5. *** (     44)
          I   DEPARTMENT HEAD
          I
          I
       9. * (      1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        200       400       600       800      1000
          FREQUENCY

MEAN           0.472      STD ERR        0.050      MEDIAN         0.084
MODE           0.0        STD DEV        1.312      VARIANCE       1.722
KURTOSIS       6.556      SKEWNESS       2.814      RANGE          5.000
MINIMUM        0.0        MAXIMUM        5.000

VALID CASES      695      MISSING CASES      1
```

```
HQSEC      HEADQUARTERS SECTION HEAD OR ABOVE

     CODE
          I
       0. ******************************** (    605)
          I  NO
          I
          I
       1. ***** (    89)
          I  YES
          I
          I
       5. * (      1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I
       9. * (      1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        200       400       600       800       1000
          FREQUENCY

MEAN            0.128     STD ERR         0.013     MEDIAN          0.074
MODE            0.0       STD DEV         0.335     VARIANCE        0.112
KURTOSIS        2.975     SKEWNESS        2.229     RANGE           1.000
MINIMUM         0.0       MAXIMUM         1.000

VALID CASES      694      MISSING CASES      2
```

```
MOBILE    MOBILE INSTRUCTOR PILOT

     CODE
          I
    0.    ********************************* (    624)
          I  NO
          I
          I
    1.    ***** (    71)
          I  YES
          I
          I
    9.    * (     1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        200       400       600       800      1000
          FREQUENCY

MEAN          0.102     STD ERR         0.011     MEDIAN         0.057
MODE          0.0       STD DEV         0.303     VARIANCE       0.092
KURTOSIS      4.947     SKEWNESS        2.633     RANGE          1.000
MINIMUM       0.0       MAXIMUM         1.000

VALID CASES     695     MISSING CASES       1
```

```
ARSC      A.R.S.C. PILOT

     CODE
          I
       0. ********************************** (    658)
          I  NO
          I
          I
       1. *** (    37)
          I  YES
          I
          I
       9. * (     1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        200       400       600       800      1000
          FREQUENCY

MEAN          0.053     STD ERR       0.009     MEDIAN        0.028
MODE          0.0       STD DEV       0.225     VARIANCE      0.050
KURTOSIS     13.949     SKEWNESS      3.989     RANGE         1.000
MINIMUM       0.0       MAXIMUM       1.000

VALID CASES     695     MISSING CASES     1
```

```
MARITAL   MARITAL STATUS

     CODE
          I
       0. ******************************* (    608)
          I   MARRIED
          I
          I
       1. ***** (    87)
          I   SINGLE
          I
          I
       9. * (     1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        200       400       600       800      1000
          FREQUENCY

MEAN            0.125      STD ERR       0.013      MEDIAN        0.072
MODE            0.0        STD DEV       0.331      VARIANCE      0.110
KURTOSIS        3.163      SKEWNESS      2.270      RANGE         1.000
MINIMUM         0.0        MAXIMUM       1.000

VALID CASES      695       MISSING CASES     1
```

```
CIVILP    HIGHEST CIVIL RATING HELD

     CODE
           I
       0.  ******************* (    179)
           I   NONE
           I
           I
       1.  ** (     12)
           I   PRIVATE LICENSE
           I
           I
       2.  ****************************************** (    403)
           I   COMMERCIAL LICENSE
           I
           I
       3.  *** (     16)
           I   ATP LICENSE
           I
           I
       4.  ********** (     85)
           I   ATP AND TYPE RATINGS
           I
           I
       9.  * (      1)
(MISSING)  I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        100       200       300       400       500
           FREQUENCY

MEAN          1.735     STD ERR       0.046     MEDIAN        1.888
MODE          2.000     STD DEV       1.221     VARIANCE      1.492
KURTOSIS     -0.462     SKEWNESS      0.069     RANGE         4.000
MINIMUM       0.0       MAXIMUM       4.000

VALID CASES     695     MISSING CASES     1
```

```
INSTP     CIVIL INSTRUCTOR RATING HELD

     CODE
          I
       0. ******************************** (    616)
          I  NONE
          I
          I
       1. * (     3)
          I  GROUND INSTRUCTOR
          I
          I
       2. ***** (    76)
          I  FLIGHT INSTRUCTOR
          I
          I
       9. * (     1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        200       400       600       800      1000
          FREQUENCY

MEAN           0.223      STD ERR       0.024       MEDIAN          0.064
MODE           0.0        STD DEV       0.627       VARIANCE        0.393
KURTOSIS       4.159      SKEWNESS      2.474       RANGE           2.000
MINIMUM        0.0        MAXIMUM       2.000

VALID CASES      695      MISSING CASES      1
```

```
CURRENT   CIVIL RATINGS CURRENT?

     CODE
           I
       0.  ********  (    140)
           I  YES
           I
           I
       1.  ******************************  (    555)
           I  NO
           I
           I
       9.  *  (     1)
 (MISSING) I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        200       400       600       800      1000
           FREQUENCY

MEAN         0.799     STD ERR      0.015     MEDIAN       0.874
MODE         1.000     STD DEV      0.401     VARIANCE     0.161
KURTOSIS     0.227     SKEWNESS    -1.492     RANGE        1.000
MINIMUM      0.0       MAXIMUM      1.000

VALID CASES    695     MISSING CASES    1
```

11/13/81 FILE - THESIS - CREATED 09/30/81

JOBS NUMBER OF JOBS OUTSIDE OF COAST GUARD

```
     CODE
          I
       0. ******************************************** (    430)
          I    NONE
          I
          I
       1. ************ (    113)
          I    ONE
          I
          I
       2. ********** (     86)
          I    TWO
          I
          I
       3. ******** (     66)
          I   THREE OR MORE
          I
          I
       9. * (      1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	0.695	STD ERR	0.039	MEDIAN	0.308
MODE	0.0	STD DEV	1.015	VARIANCE	1.031
KURTOSIS	0.016	SKEWNESS	1.185	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	0.0	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 695 MISSING CASES 1

ENLIST ENLISTED TIME IN ANY SERVICE

```
     CODE
            I
       0.   ********************** (    220)
            I  YES
            I
            I
       1.   ************************************************ (    475)
            I  NO
            I
            I
       9.   * (      1)
(MISSING)   I
            I
            I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
            0        100       200       300       400       500
            FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	0.683	STD ERR	0.018	MEDIAN	0.768
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.465	VARIANCE	0.217
KURTOSIS	-1.379	SKEWNESS	-0.791	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	0.0	MAXIMUM	1.000		

VALID CASES 695 MISSING CASES 1

11/13/81 FILE - THESIS - CREATED 09/30/81

SERVEK BREAKS IN SERVICE

```
     CODE
           I
       0.  ******** (    148)
           I   YES
           I
           I
       1.  ***************************** (    547)
           I   NO
           I
           I
       9.  * (      1)
 (MISSING) I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        200       400       600       800      1000
           FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	0.787	STD ERR	0.016	MEDIAN	0.865
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.410	VARIANCE	0.168
KURTOSIS	-0.025	SKEWNESS	-1.405	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	0.0	MAXIMUM	1.000		

VALID CASES 695 MISSING CASES 1

```
MOTIV     REASON FOR JOINING COAST GUARD

     CODE
              I
       1.     ** (     13)
              I   TRAVEL OPPORTUNITIES
              I
              I
       2.     **** (     29)
              I   RELATIVE IN SERVICE
              I
              I
       3.     ************************ (    242)
              I   SEARCH AND RESCUE
              I
              I
       4.     ********* (     84)
              I   ALTERNATIVE TO DRAFT
              I
              I
       5.     *************** (    150)
              I   OTHER REASON
              I
              I
       6.     ********** (    100)
              I   EDUCATION-CGA
              I
              I
       9.     ******** (     72)
              I   MULTIPLE REASONS
              I
              I
       8.     ** (      6)
 (MISSING)    I
              I
              I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
              0        100       200       300       400       500
              FREQUENCY

MEAN           4.538     STD ERR       0.074     MEDIAN          4.226
MODE           3.000     STD DEV       1.952     VARIANCE        3.811
KURTOSIS       0.376     SKEWNESS      0.936     RANGE           8.000
MINIMUM        1.000     MAXIMUM       9.000

VALID CASES      690     MISSING CASES     6
```

```
SURV02    ENTER INTENDING TO BE A PILOT?

     CODE
            I
        1.  ************************** (    506)
            I  YES
            I
            I
        2.  ********** (    186)
            I  NO
            I
            I
        9.  * (      4)
 (MISSING)  I
            I
            I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
            0        200       400       600       800      1000
            FREQUENCY

MEAN            1.269     STD ERR       0.017     MEDIAN        1.184
MODE            1.000     STD DEV       0.444     VARIANCE      0.197
KURTOSIS       -0.910     SKEWNESS      1.045     RANGE         1.000
MINIMUM         1.000     MAXIMUM       2.000

VALID CASES       692     MISSING CASES     4
```

```
SURV03    INTENTIONS TO STAY AT LEAST 20YR

     CODE
          I
     1.   *** (     20)
          I   WILL SURELY RESIGN
          I
          I
     2.   *** (     18)
          I   PROBABLY RESIGN
          I
          I
     3.   ******* (     61)
          I   UNDECIDED
          I
          I
     4.   ********************* (    198)
          I   PROBABLY STAY IN
          I
          I
     5.   **************************************** (    391)
          I   SURELY STAY IN
          I
          I
     9.   ** (      8)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

MEAN           4.340     STD ERR        0.036     MEDIAN          4.620
MODE           5.000     STD DEV        0.953     VARIANCE        0.909
KURTOSIS       2.857     SKEWNESS      -1.715     RANGE           4.000
MINIMUM        1.000     MAXIMUM        5.000

VALID CASES      688     MISSING CASES      8
```

```
SURV04     AVERAGE TOUR LENGHT SHOULD BE___

     CODE
           I
       1.  ************************************************** (    449)
           I   LONGER
           I
           I
       2.  ************************** (    234)
           I   ABOUT THE SAME
           I
           I
       3.  ** (      5)
           I   SHORTER
           I
           I
       9.  ** (      8)
 (MISSING) I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        100       200       300       400       500
           FREQUENCY

MEAN             1.355       STD ERR         0.019       MEDIAN          1.266
MODE             1.000       STD DEV         0.494       VARIANCE        0.244
KURTOSIS        -0.929       SKEWNESS        0.790       RANGE           2.000
MINIMUM          1.000       MAXIMUM         3.000

VALID CASES      688         MISSING CASES      8
```

```
SURV05    DISLIKE IDEA OF NON-FLY STAFF JOB

     CODE
           I
      1.   ********************** (    210)
           I   AGREE STRONGLY
           I
           I
      2.   ************** (    132)
           I
           I
           I
      3.   ************ (    114)
           I
           I
           I
      4.   ************* (    124)
           I
           I
           I
      5.   ************ (    110)
           I   DISAGREE STRONGLY
           I
           I
      9.   ** (     6)
 (MISSING) I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        100       200       300       400       500
           FREQUENCY

MEAN            2.699      STD ERR        0.056      MEDIAN          2.526
MODE            1.000      STD DEV        1.462      VARIANCE        2.138
KURTOSIS       -1.341      SKEWNESS       0.253      RANGE           4.000
MINIMUM         1.000      MAXIMUM        5.000

VALID CASES      690       MISSING CASES      6
```

```
SURV06    COLLATERALS TOO IMPORT ON FITREP

     CODE
           I
       1.  *********************** (    220)
           I   AGREE STRONGLY
           I
           I
       2.  ***************** (    161)
           I
           I
           I
       3.  ********** (     89)
           I
           I
           I
       4.  ************** (    131)
           I
           I
           I
       5.  ********** (     88)
           I   DISAGREE STRONGLY
           I
           I
       9.  ** (      7)
  (MISSING) I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        100       200       300       400       500
           FREQUENCY

MEAN            2.573      STD ERR        0.054      MEDIAN          2.273
MODE            1.000      STD DEV        1.426      VARIANCE        2.033
KURTOSIS       -1.252      SKEWNESS       0.381      RANGE           4.000
MINIMUM         1.000      MAXIMUM        5.000

VALID CASES      689       MISSING CASES      7
```

```
11/13/81          FILE - THESIS    - CREATED 09/30/81

SURV07    WOULD ENJOY BEING ADMIN OFFICER

     CODE
           I
        1. ******************************************** (    172)
           I   DISAGREE STRONGLY
           I
           I
        2. ********************************** (    131)
           I
           I
           I
        3. *************************************** (    153)
           I
           I
           I
        4. ************************************ (    140)
           I
           I
           I
        5. ************************ (     92)
           I   AGREE STRONGLY
           I
           I
        9. *** (     8)
 (MISSING) I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        40        80       120       160       200
           FREQUENCY

MEAN            2.781      STD ERR       0.052      MEDIAN         2.768
MODE            1.000      STD DEV       1.372      VARIANCE       1.883
KURTOSIS       -1.225      SKEWNESS      0.129      RANGE          4.000
MINIMUM         1.000      MAXIMUM       5.000

VALID CASES      688      MISSING CASES      8
```

```
SURV08     WOULD CHOOSE FLYING OVER LOCATION

     CODE
          I
     1.   ************************** (    250)
          I   AGREE STRONGLY
          I
          I
     2.   **************** (    149)
          I
          I
          I
     3.   ************* (    115)
          I
          I
          I
     4.   ************ (    107)
          I
          I
          I
     5.   ********* (    75)
          I   DISAGREE STRONGLY
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

MEAN          2.437     STD ERR        0.053     MEDIAN         2.158
MODE          1.000     STD DEV        1.386     VARIANCE       1.921
KURTOSIS     -1.063     SKEWNESS       0.509     RANGE          4.000
MINIMUM       1.000     MAXIMUM        5.000

VALID CASES     696     MISSING CASES      0
```

```
SURV09    WOULD BE___IN OTHER CG BRANCH

     CODE
          I
    1.    ************************ (    221)
          I  VERY UNHAPPY
          I
          I
    2.    ********************* (    193)
          I
          I
          I
    3.    ************* (    122)
          I
          I
          I
    4.    *********** (     97)
          I
          I
          I
    5.    ******* (    63)
          I  JUST AS HAPPY
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

MEAN            2.408     STD ERR        0.049     MEDIAN          2.158
MODE            1.000     STD DEV        1.304     VARIANCE        1.701
KURTOSIS       -0.828     SKEWNESS       0.575     RANGE           4.000
MINIMUM         1.000     MAXIMUM        5.000

VALID CASES      696      MISSING CASES      0
```

SURV10 WOULD ENJOY BEING XO

```
     CODE
         I
       1. ********* (     84)
         I   DISAGREE STRONGLY
         I
         I
       2. ********** (     94)
         I
         I
         I
       3. ************ (    118)
         I
         I
         I
       4. **************** (    152)
         I
         I
         I
       5. ************************* (    245)
         I   AGREE STRONGLY
         I
         I
       9. * (      3)
(MISSING) I
         I
         I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
         0        100       200       300       400       500
         FREQUENCY
```

MEAN	3.548	STD ERR	0.053	MEDIAN	3.832
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.399	VARIANCE	1.956
KURTOSIS	-1.037	SKEWNESS	-0.527	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 693 MISSING CASES 3

```
SURV11     IF JUST WANT TO FLY DONT PUT AS MUCH EFFORT INTO
           COLLATERAL DUTIES AS OTHERS DO

     CODE
           I
       1.  ******************************* (     121)
           I  DISAGREE STRONGLY
           I
           I
       2.  *************************** (     103)
           I
           I
           I
       3.  ********************** (      90)
           I
           I
           I
       4.  ************************************************* (     194)
           I
           I
           I
       5.  *********************************************** (     187)
           I  AGREE STRONGLY
           I
           I
       9.  * (       1)
 (MISSING) I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        40        80       120       160       200
           FREQUENCY

MEAN           3.321      STD ERR        0.055      MEDIAN         3.673
MODE           4.000      STD DEV        1.449      VARIANCE       2.100
KURTOSIS      -1.249      SKEWNESS      -0.383      RANGE          4.000
MINIMUM        1.000      MAXIMUM        5.000

VALID CASES      695      MISSING CASES     1
```

```
SURV12    AVG MONHTLY FLT TIME___THAN LIKE

     CODE
         I
       1. ************************************* (    367)
         I  LOWER THAN LIKE
         I
         I
       2. **************** (    159)
         I
         I
         I
       3. **************** (    157)
         I
         I
         I
       4. ** (      8)
         I
         I
         I
       5. (0)
         I  HIGHER THAN WOULD LIKE
         I
         I
       9. ** (      5)
(MISSING) I
         I
         I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
         0        100       200       300       400       500
         FREQUENCY

MEAN          1.719      STD ERR       0.032      MEDIAN          1.441
MODE          1.000      STD DEV       0.853      VARIANCE        0.727
KURTOSIS     -0.971      SKEWNESS      0.684      RANGE           3.000
MINIMUM       1.000      MAXIMUM       4.000

VALID CASES     691      MISSING CASES     5
```

```
SURV13    FLYING MORE IMPORT THAN STAFF DUTIES TO ME

     CODE
           I
       1.  ***************  (      57)
           I  AGREE STRONGLY
           I
           I
       2.  ***********************************  (    135)
           I
           I
           I
       3.  ********************************************  (    170)
           I
           I
           I
       4.  *********************************************  (    174)
           I
           I
           I
       5.  ****************************************  (    157)
           I  DISAGREE STRONGLY
           I
           I
       9.  **  (      3)
  (MISSING) I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        40        80       120       160       200
           FREQUENCY

MEAN           3.345     STD ERR       0.048     MEDIAN        3.409
MODE           4.000     STD DEV       1.251     VARIANCE      1.564
KURTOSIS      -1.001     SKEWNESS     -0.229     RANGE         4.000
MINIMUM        1.000     MAXIMUM       5.000

VALID CASES      693     MISSING CASES     3
```

```
;URV14    DISLIKE PAPERWK___THAN OTHERS

     CODE
          I
      1.  *** (     22)
          I  MUCH MORE
          I
          I
      2.  ********* (     78)
          I
          I
          I
      3.  *********************************** (    344)
          I
          I
          I
      4.  ******************* (    175)
          I
          I
          I
      5.  ******** (     73)
          I  MUCH LESS
          I
          I
      9.  * (      4)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

IEAN          3.288     STD ERR        0.035     MEDIAN         3.215
IODE          3.000     STD DEV        0.913     VARIANCE       0.833
:URTOSIS      0.124     SKEWNESS      -0.016     RANGE          4.000
IINIMUM       1.000     MAXIMUM        5.000

'ALID CASES     692     MISSING CASES      4
```

```
SURV15     WOULD FOREGO CDR TO FLY 20

     CODE
             I
       1.    ********** (      86)
             I   AGREE STRONGLY
             I
             I
       2.    ********* (      83)
             I
             I
             I
       3.    ******** (      69)
             I
             I
             I
       4.    ************ (     113)
             I
             I
             I
       5.    ************************************ (     340)
             I   DISAGREE STRONGLY
             I
             I
       9.    * (      5)
 (MISSING)   I
             I
             I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
             0        100       200       300       400       500
             FREQUENCY

MEAN          3.779      STD ERR       0.056      MEDIAN        4.451
MODE          5.000      STD DEV       1.465      VARIANCE      2.147
KURTOSIS     -0.875      SKEWNESS     -0.797      RANGE         4.000
MINIMUM       1.000      MAXIMUM       5.000

VALID CASES     691      MISSING CASES     5
```

```
:URV16     BEST TOUR LENGTH IS______

    CODE
           I
      1.   ******** (     68)
           I   6 YEARS OR MORE
           I
           I
           I
      2.   ************** (     133)
           I   5 YEARS
           I
           I
           I
      3.   ****************************************  (     380)
           I   FOUR YEARS
           I
           I
      4.   ************ (     108)
           I   THREE YEARS
           I
           I
      5.   ** (      5)
           I   TWO YEARS OR LESS
           I
           I
      9.   * (      2)
(MISSING)  I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        100       200       300       400       500
           FREQUENCY

IEAN          2.782      STD ERR       0.032      MEDIAN         2.884
IODE          3.000      STD DEV       0.850      VARIANCE       0.722
:URTOSIS      0.048      SKEWNESS     -0.461      RANGE          4.000
IINIMUM       1.000      MAXIMUM       5.000

'ALID CASES     694      MISSING CASES     2
```

```
:URV17     SHCULD DEVELOP INSTRUCTOR PILOT QUALS

     CODE
          I
     1.   *************************** (     253)
          I   AGREE STRONGLY
          I
          I
     2.   ******************* (     182)
          I
          I
          I
     3.   ******** (     71)
          I
          I
          I
     4.   ********** (     92)
          I
          I
          I
     5.   ********** (     94)
          I   DISAGREE STRONGLY
          I
          I
     9.   * (      4)
:MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

.EAN           2.410      STD ERR        0.055      MEDIAN         2.011
ODE            1.000      STD DEV        1.434      VARIANCE       2.057
:URTOSIS      -1.002      SKEWNESS       0.637      RANGE          4.000
.INIMUM        1.000      MAXIMUM        5.000

ALID CASES      692       MISSING CASES      4
```

```
URV18     PILOTS SHOULD FLY OTHERS SHD ADMIN

    CODE
          I
      1.  ************** (    127)
          I  AGREE STRONGLY
          I
          I
      2.  ********************* (    202)
          I
          I
          I
      3.  ************ (    108)
          I
          I
          I
      4.  ***************** (    166)
          I
          I
          I
      5.  ********** (    89)
          I  DISAGREE STRONGLY
          I
          I
      9.  * (     4)
MISSING)  I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

EAN            2.838    STD ERR       0.050    MEDIAN        2.657
ODE            2.000    STD DEV       1.325    VARIANCE      1.757
URTOSIS       -1.217    SKEWNESS      0.157    RANGE         4.000
INIMUM         1.000    MAXIMUM       5.000

ALID CASES      692     MISSING CASES     4
```

```
:URV19    PRIMARILY IN CG TO FLY CG ACFT

    CODE
          I
     1.   *******************************************  (    174)
          I  AGREE STRONGLY
          I
          I
     2.   **************************************  (    156)
          I
          I
          I
     3.   *************************************  (    150)
          I
          I
          I
     4.   ******************************  (    128)
          I
          I
          I
     5.   **********************  (     87)
          I  DISAGREE STRONGLY
          I
          I
     9.   *  (      1)
:MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        40        80       120       160       200
          FREQUENCY

IEAN          2.709      STD ERR       0.051      MEDIAN        2.617
IODE          1.000      STD DEV       1.352      VARIANCE      1.829
:URTOSIS     -1.155      SKEWNESS      0.234      RANGE         4.000
IINIMUM       1.000      MAXIMUM       5.000

'ALID CASES     695      MISSING CASES     1
```

```
;URV20     WOULD XFER OUT TO FLY

     CODE
            I
     1.     ***********  (     95)
            I   AGREE STRONGLY
            I
            I
     2.     *********  (     76)
            I
            I
            I
     3.     ********  (     70)
            I
            I
            I
     4.     *************  (    116)
            I
            I
            I
     5.     ************************************  (    336)
            I   DISAGREE STRONGLY
            I
            I
     9.     *  (     3)
(MISSING)   I
            I
            I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
            0        100       200       300       400       500
            FREQUENCY

:EAN          3.753     STD ERR      0.056     MEDIAN       4.409
:ODE          5.000     STD DEV      1.483     VARIANCE     2.201
:URTOSIS     -0.902     SKEWNESS    -0.786     RANGE        4.000
:INIMUM       1.000     MAXIMUM      5.000

'ALID CASES     693     MISSING CASES    3
```

```
URV21    IMPORT OF BEING XO OR CO

    CODE
         I
     1.  *************  (     121)
         I   VERY UNIMPORTANT
         I
         I
     2.  ********  (     73)
         I
         I
         I
     3.  *************  (     119)
         I
         I
         I
     4.  *****************  (     162)
         I
         I
         I
     5.  ***********************  (     220)
         I   VERY IMPORTANT
         I
         I
     9.  *  (      1)
(MISSING) I
         I
         I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
         0        100       200       300       400       500
         FREQUENCY
```

IEAN	3.413	STD ERR	0.055	MEDIAN	3.713
IODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.461	VARIANCE	2.133
:URTOSIS	-1.157	SKEWNESS	-0.465	RANGE	4.000
IINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

'ALID CASES 695 MISSING CASES 1

```
:URV22    IMPORT OF FLYING CG ACFT

     CODE
          I
     1.   ********************************** (    332)
          I   VERY IMPORTANT
          I
          I
     2.   *********************** (    223)
          I
          I
          I
     3.   ********** (    90)
          I
          I
          I
     4.   **** (    32)
          I
          I
          I
     5.   *** (    17)
          I   VERY UNIMPORTANT
          I
          I
     9.   * (     2)
:MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

[EAN         1.817     STD ERR     0.038     MEDIAN      1.567
[ODE         1.000     STD DEV     0.990     VARIANCE    0.981
:URTOSIS     1.217     SKEWNESS    1.267     RANGE       4.000
[INIMUM      1.000     MAXIMUM     5.000

'ALID CASES    694     MISSING CASES    2
```

```
;URV23    IMPORT OF PARTIC IN CG AVTN DECISIONS

     CODE
          I
     1.   ****************************** (    279)
          I   VERY IMPORTANT
          I
          I
     2.   ******************************* (    285)
          I
          I
          I
     3.   ********** (    93)
          I
          I
          I
     4.   *** (    24)
          I
          I
          I
     5.   ** (     14)
          I   VERY UNIMPORTANT
          I
          I
     9.   * (      1)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

IEAN          1.862      STD ERR      0.035      MEDIAN        1.740
IODE          2.000      STD DEV      0.915      VARIANCE      0.837
:URTOSIS      1.490      SKEWNESS     1.183      RANGE         4.000
IINIMUM       1.000      MAXIMUM      5.000

'ALID CASES     695      MISSING CASES    1
```

```
:URV24    IMPORT OF BECOMING UNUSUALLY GOOD PILOT

    CODE
          I
      1.  ******************************************* (    433)
          I  VERY IMPORTANT
          I
          I
      2.  ****************** (    184)
          I
          I
          I
      3.  ****** (    54)
          I
          I
          I
      4.  *** (    19)
          I
          I
          I
      5.  * (     4)
          I  VERY UNIMPORTANT
          I
          I
      9.  * (     2)
:MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

:EAN          1.526     STD ERR       0.030     MEDIAN        1.301
IODE          1.000     STD DEV       0.800     VARIANCE      0.639
:URTOSIS      2.656     SKEWNESS      1.656     RANGE         4.000
IINIMUM       1.000     MAXIMUM       5.000

'ALID CASES     694     MISSING CASES     2
```

```
:URV25    IMPORT OF PARTIC IN CG WIDE DECISIONS

     CODE
          I
       1. **** (      25)
          I  VERY UNIMPORTANT
          I
          I
       2. ******* (      64)
          I
          I
          I
       3. **************** (     145)
          I
          I
          I
       4. *************************** (     257)
          I
          I
          I
       5. ******************** (     204)
          I  VERY IMPORTANT
          I
          I
       9. * (       1)
 MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

EAN            3.793      STD ERR       0.041      MEDIAN        3.942
ODE            4.000      STD DEV       1.074      VARIANCE      1.153
:URTOSIS      -0.090      SKEWNESS     -0.729      RANGE         4.000
.INIMUM        1.000      MAXIMUM       5.000

'ALID CASES      695      MISSING CASES      1
```

URV26 IMPCRT OF BEING EVALUATED ONLY AS PILOT

```
    CODE
         I
   1.    ****** (     47)
         I   VERY IMPORTANT
         I
         I
   2.    ***************** (     153)
         I
         I
         I
   3.    ********************** (     214)
         I
         I
         I
   4.    ***************** (     159)
         I
         I
         I
   5.    ************* (     117)
         I   VERY UNIMPORTANT
         I
         I
   9.    ** (      6)
MISSING) I
         I
         I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
         0        100       200       300       400       500
         FREQUENCY
```

EAN	3.212	STD ERR	0.044	MEDIAN	3.178
ODE	3.000	STD DEV	1.166	VARIANCE	1.360
URTOSIS	-0.866	SKEWNESS	-0.032	RANGE	4.000
INIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

ALID CASES 690 MISSING CASES 6

```
URV27     IMPCRT OF SERV ON HIGH RESP STAFF

    CODE
         I
      1. ************************************** (     150)
         I  VERY UNIMPORTANT
         I
         I
      2. ******************************* (     121)
         I
         I
         I
      3. ***************************************** (     164)
         I
         I
         I
      4. **************************************** (     158)
         I
         I
         I
      5. ************************* (     100)
         I  VERY IMPORTANT
         I
         I
      9. ** (       3)
MISSING) I
         I
         I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
         0        40        80       120       160       200
         FREQUENCY

EAN          2.909     STD ERR       0.052     MEDIAN        2.960
ODE          3.000     STD DEV       1.356     VARIANCE      1.840
URTOSIS     -1.200     SKEWNESS     -0.009     RANGE         4.000
INIMUM       1.000     MAXIMUM       5.000

ALID CASES     693     MISSING CASES     3
```

```
1/13/81          FILE - THESIS    - CREATED 09/30/81

URV28    CAREER OF PILOT OR OFFICER

    CODE
           I
      1.   *********************** (     92)
           I  MOSTLY AS A PILOT
           I
           I
      2.   ************************************** (    151)
           I
           I
           I
      3.   ******************************************** (    176)
           I
           I
           I
      4.   ************************************* (    147)
           I
           I
           I
      5.   ******************************** (    127)
           I  MOSTLY AS AN OFFICER
           I
           I
      9.   ** (      3)
MISSING)   I
           I
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0        40        80       120       160       200
           FREQUENCY

EAN           3.095      STD ERR       0.049      MEDIAN        3.088
ODE           3.000      STD DEV       1.299      VARIANCE      1.687
URTOSIS      -1.088      SKEWNESS     -0.038      RANGE         4.000
INIMUM        1.000      MAXIMUM       5.000

ALID CASES     693       MISSING CASES     3
```

```
1/13/81          FILE - THESIS   - CREATED 09/30/81

URV29     ____IN BECOMING UNIT INSTR PILOT

    CODE
          I
     1.   ********************************** (    316)
          I   VERY INTERESTED
          I
          I
     2.   ***************** (    163)
          I
          I
          I
     3.   ********** (     93)
          I
          I
          I
     4.   ****** (     52)
          I
          I
          I
     5.   ******** (     70)
          I   VERY UNINTERESTED
          I
          I
     9.   * (      2)
MISSING)  I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

EAN             2.131      STD ERR        0.051      MEDIAN          1.690
ODE             1.000      STD DEV        1.335      VARIANCE        1.782
URTOSIS        -0.288      SKEWNESS       0.971      RANGE           4.000
INIMUM          1.000      MAXIMUM        5.000

ALID CASES      694        MISSING CASES      2
```

```
CRV30     ____PARTIC IN FLY ONLY CAREER PRGM

    CODE
          I
      1.  ******************************* (    292)
          I  WOULD
          I
          I
      2.  ************** (    134)
          I
          I
          I
      3.  ************ (    113)
          I
          I
          I
      4.  ******* (     55)
          I
          I
          I
      5.  *********** (    100)
          I  WOULD NOT
          I
          I
      9.  * (      2)
MISSING)  I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

EAN            2.333     STD ERR      0.055     MEDIAN       1.910
ODE            1.000     STD DEV      1.446     VARIANCE     2.090
URTOSIS       -0.869     SKEWNESS     0.714     RANGE        4.000
INIMUM         1.000     MAXIMUM      5.000

ALID CASES      694      MISSING CASES     2
```

```
URV31     ____PARTIC IN FLY ONLY CAREER PRGM IF LIMITED TO LCDR

    CODE
          I
      1.  ************** (    130)
          I   WOULD
          I
          I
      2.  ********* (    75)
          I
          I
          I
      3.  ********* (    80)
          I
          I
          I
      4.  ********* (    82)
          I
          I
          I
      5.  ********************************** (    326)
          I   WOULD NOT
          I
          I
      9.  * (     3)
MISSING)  I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        100       200       300       400       500
          FREQUENCY

EAN          3.576      STD ERR      0.060      MEDIAN        4.250
ODE          5.000      STD DEV      1.591      VARIANCE      2.531
URTOSIS     -1.298      SKEWNESS    -0.570      RANGE         4.000
INIMUM       1.000      MAXIMUM      5.000

ALID CASES     693      MISSING CASES     3
```

```
)MB

    CODE
          I
      2.  ******************************** (     123)
          I  HIGHLY COSMOPOLITAN
          I
          I
      3.  ************* (     47)
          I
          I
          I
      4.  **************** (     61)
          I
          I
          I
      5.  ************* (     47)
          I
          I
          I
      6.  *********************************** (     134)
          I
          I
          I
      7.  ***************** (     63)
          I
          I
          I
      8.  ******************** (     76)
          I
          I
          I
      9.  ************ (     43)
          I
          I
          I
     10.  ************************** (     100)
          I   HIGHLY LOCAL
          I
          I
     18.  ** (     2)
(MISSING) I
          I
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0        40        80       120       160       200
          FREQUENCY

EAN          5.951    STD ERR      0.105    MEDIAN      6.022
)DE          6.000    STD DEV      2.767    VARIANCE    7.658
URTOSIS     -0.325    SKEWNESS     0.190    RANGE      16.000
INIMUM       2.000    MAXIMUM     18.000

ALID CASES    696     MISSING CASES    0
```

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barber, B., "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," Daedalus, Fall, 1965.

Bentz, V.J., A Study of Leadership in a Liberal Arts College, Mimeograph, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1950.

Blau, P.M. and Scott, W.R., Formal Organizations, San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Bond, D.D., The Love and Fear of Flying, New York: International University Press, 1952.

Campbell, D.P., Manual for the SVIB-SCII, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1977.

Carver, M.L., "No Surprise Why Pilots Leave Service," Air Force Times, 4 June, 1979.

Carver, M.L., "The Pilot Exodus," Air Force Times, 24 March, 1980.

Cogan, M.L., "Toward a Definition of Profession," Harvard Educational Review, Winter, 1953.

Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, "Coast Guard Officers: How They are Selected, Promoted and Integrated," Commandant's Bulletin 29-81.

Corwin, R.G., "The Professional Employee: A Study of Conflict in Nursing Roles," American Journal of Sociology, No. 66, 1961.

Dalton, M., "Conflicts Between Line and Staff Managerial Officers," American Sociological Review, June, 1950.

Day, B.A., "Navy Pilots are Bailing Out," Naval Institute Proceedings, October, 1979.

Dyer, R.F., et. al., Questionnaire Construction Manual, U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Fort Hood, Texas, September, 1976.

Fine, P.M. and Hartmen, B.O., Psychiatric Strengths and Weaknesses of Typical Air Force Pilots, School of Aerospace Medicine, Brooks A.F.B., Texas, Project 7755, November, 1968.

Francis, R.G. and Stone, R.C., Service and Procedure in Bureaucracy, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Goldner, F. and Ritti, R., "Professionalization as Career Immobility," The Sociology of Organizations, Grunsky and Miller eds., New York, Free Press, 1970.

Goldstein, B., "Some Aspects of Unionism Among Salaried Professionals in Industry," American Sociological Review, March 1958.

Gouldner, A.W., "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles," Administrative Science Quarterly, December, 1957.

Gross, M., et. al., Exploration in Role Analysis, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Gulick, C.E. and Laakman, H.E., An Analysis of Factors Influencing the Turnover of Unites States Air Force Pilots in the Six to Eleven Year Group, Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson A.F.B., June, 1980.

Hall, R.H., "Professionalization and Bureaucratization," American Sociological Review, Vol. 33, 1968.

Holemon, K., Coast Guard Aviators, Unpublished Staff Study Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard (G-OSR-2), Washington, D.C. 13 August, 1980.

Klatt, L., "The Professionalization of Everyone," Personnel Journal, March, 1978.

Kornhauser, W., Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1962.

Landsbury, R., Professionals and Management, St. Lucia, Australia, University of Queensland Press, 1978.

Matthews, W.T., et. al., Job Satisfaction and Retention of Marine Corps Flight Instructors, CRC-364, Center for Naval Analysis, Arlington, Virginia, November, 1978.

McCormick, E.G. and Ilgen, D.R., Industrial Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1980.

Merton, R.V., Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Ill., Irwin, 1957.

Millard, C.A., Factors that Effect the Career Decisions of Marine Corps Pilots and Flight Officers CRC-403, Center for Naval Analysis, Arlington, Virginia, September, 1979.

NAVPERS 15658(A), Navy Military Personnel Statistics, FY-79 Annual Report, Statistics Office, Washington, D.C., September, 1979.

Nie, N.H., et. al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Rickus, G.M., Booth, R.F. and Amoler, R.K., Comparison of Career and Non-Career Naval Aviators, Naval Aeromedical Institute, BUMEDSURGmf 12.524.002.5001.56, Special Report 68-2, Pensacola, Florida, 24 July, 1968.

Robertson, D.W., Career Related Values of Designated Naval Aviators and Naval Flight Officers, Naval Personnel Research Activity, San Diego, October, 1966.

Scott, W.R., "Professionals in Bureaucracies - Areas of Conflict," Professionalization, Vollmer and Miller, eds., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Shepherd, C., "Orientations of Scientists and Engineers," Pacific Sociological Review, Spring, 1961.

Sheposh, J.P., et. al., Factors Relating to Naval Aviator Career Decisions, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, August, 1980.

Sorensen, J.E. and Sorensen, T.L., "The Conflict of Professionals in Bureaucratic Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, January, 1974.

Thompson, V.A., Modern Organizations, New York, Knoff, 1961.

Vollmer, H.M. and Mills, D.L. (eds.), Professionalization, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1966.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

		No. Copies
1.	Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	2
2.	Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	2
3.	Department Chairman, Code 54 Department of Administrative Sciences Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
4.	Professor J. Senger Code 54Se Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
5.	Professor R. Weitzman Code 54Wz Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
6.	Professor K. Euske Code 54Ee Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
7.	Lt. D.A. Goward c/o Commandant (G-OSR-2) U.S. Coast Guard Washington, D.C. 20593	2
8.	Commandant (G-PTE) U.S. Coast Guard Washington, D.C. 20593	1
9.	Commandant (G-PO) U.S. Coast Guard Washington, D.C. 20593	1
10.	Commandant (G-P-1/2) U.S. Coast Guard Washington, D.C. 20593	1
11.	Commandant (G-PO-2/3) U.S. Coast Guard Washington, D.C. 20593	1
12.	Capt. T.T. Matteson c/o Commandant (G-PO) U.S. Coast Guard Washington, D.C. 20593	1

13. LCDR K. Holemon 1
c/o Commandant (G-OSR-2)
U.S. Coast Guard
Washington, D.C. 20593

14. CAPT D.E. Ciangaglini 1
Commanding Officer
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Route 1 Box 950
Warrenton, Oregon 97146

15. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Corpus Christi, Texas 78419

16. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Elizabeth City, N.C. 27909

17. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Barbers Point, Hi. 96862

18. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
c/o U.S.C.G. Support Center, Box 33
Kodiak, Alaska 99619

19. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Route 1, Box 950
Warrenton, Oregon 97146

20. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Port Angeles, Wa. 98362

21. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
McClellan A.F.B.
Sacramento, Ca. 95652

22. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
c/o Naval Air Station
Glenview, Illinois 60026

23. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
2710 Harbor Drive
San Diego, Ca. 92101

24. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Selfridge A.F.B., Michigan 48045

25. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Eilington A.F.B.
Houston, Texas 77209

26. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Floyd Bennett Field
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11234

27. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Otis A.F.B., Ma. 02542

28. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Cape May, N.J. 08204

29. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Hunter A.A.F. Post Office
Savannah, Georgia 31409

30. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Opa Locka Airport
1300 Beach Drive
Opa Locka, Fla. 33054

31. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Clearwater, Fla. 33054

32. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station Boringuen
Ramey, Puerto Rico 00604

33. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
South San Francisco, Ca. 94128

34. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Traverse City, Michigan 49684

35. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
5885 W. Imperial Highway, Box 90220
Los Angeles, Ca. 90009

36. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
P.O. Box 445
Belle Chasse, Louisiana 70146

37. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
McKinleyville, Ca. 95521

38. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
2000 Conneticut Ave.
North Bend, Oregon 97459

38. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
P.O. Box 6-5000
Sitka, Alaska 99835

40. Polar Operations Divisions 1
U.S.C.G. Aviation Training Center
Mobile, Alabama 36608

41. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Aircraft Repair and Supply Center
Elizabeth City, N.C. 27909

42. Commanding Officer 1
U.S.C.G. Air Station
Washington National Airport
Washington, D.C. 20001

43. U.S.C.G. Aircraft Program Office 1
P.O. Box 1747
Grand Prairie, Texas 75051

44. U.S.C.G. Aircraft Program Office 1
P.O. Box 6186
Little Rock, Arkansas 72216

45. Director 1
Naval Aviation Safety Programs
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, Ca. 93940

46. Dr. D. Robertson 1
c/o Commanding Officer
Naval Personnel Research and Development Center
San Diego, Ca. 92151

47. Commanding Officer 1
Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
San Diego, Ca. 92151